OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 027 861				
CH ACC. NO. HE 000 871	P.A. 24	PUBL. DATE 1 Jan 69	ISSUE RIEAUG69	

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☐
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☐
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☐ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Gouran, Dennis S.

TITLE
An Investigation to Identify the Critical Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy. Final Report.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE) Iowa Univ., Iowa City.
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

EDRS PRICE 0.75;8.05	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO. OEG-0-8-080004-3361
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO. BR-8-F-004

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
159p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Communication (Thought Transfer); *Discriminant Analysis; Group Behavior; *Group Discussion; *Higher Education; Performance Criteria

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

During a study of group communication, efforts were made to identify variables that distinguish statements of consensus groups from those of non-consensus groups, and to determine if and how relationships between consecutive statements differ for the 2 types of groups. Six students in each of 3 consensus and 3 non-consensus groups discussed the University of Iowa's policies on grading, undergraduate women's hours, and undergraduates' possession of automobiles. Fifty pairs of consecutive statements were selected from each discussion and two-factor analyses of variance were made on the first statements in each pair of 8 separate variables. The variables were clarity of expression, opinionatedness, amount of information, interest, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length of contribution. No differences were found between the 2 types of groups on either clarity or length. The consensus group's statements revealed much more interest in women's hours and much less interest in undergraduates' possession of cars, and the group's discussion on this question was less opinionated, and more provocative, informative, and objective than those of the non-consensus group. The study has shown that there are some detectable differences in the discussion behavior of groups that reach consensus and groups which do not. A list of 8 conclusions is included, and statements on substantive, methodological, and educational implications for future research (WM)

BR-8-F-004
PA-24
OE-BR

BG 8F004
PA 24

ED027861

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-F-004
Grant No. OEG-0-8-080004-3361

AN INVESTIGATION TO IDENTIFY THE CRITICAL VARIABLES RELATED TO CONSENSUS IN GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Dennis S. Gouran
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

January 1, 1969

HE000 871

Final Report

Project No. 8-F-004
Grant No. OEG-0-8-080004-3361 (010)

AN INVESTIGATION TO IDENTIFY THE CRITICAL VARIABLES RELATED TO CONSENSUS IN GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Dennis S. Gouran

University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa

January 1, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SUMMARY vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PROCEDURE 9

III. RESULTS 31

IV. DISCUSSION 53

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS, AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS 68

APPENDIX

A. FIFTY DISCUSSION STATEMENTS RATED IN THE PRELIMINARY STUDY 77

B. INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO PARTICIPATING RHETORIC CLASSES 84

C. DISCUSSION INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS 88

D. DISCUSSION AGENDA 91

E. POST-DISCUSSION QUESTIONNAIRE 92

F. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO JUDGES IN THE FINAL STUDY 94

G. INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES 96

H. SIX HUNDRED DISCUSSION STATEMENTS FROM SIX DISCUSSIONS ON THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY 101

I. ANALYSES OF SEX DIFFERENCES 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY 151

TABLE

1. RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR RATINGS OF FIFTEEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES 13

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

TABLE Page
2. FACTOR STRUCTURE OF SIXTEEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES 14

3. FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TO CHOICES FOR EACH ITEM ON A SIX-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE 17

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS ASSIGNED TO DISCUSS THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY 19

5. MOVEMENT TOWARD CONSENSUS IN TWENTY-TWO GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF QUESTIONS OF POLICY 23

6. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS CHOSEN FOR STUDY 24

7. CHANGES IN POSITION ON THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY BY SIX DISCUSSION GROUPS 25

8. t-TESTS OF CHANGES IN STRENGTH OF BELIEF ON THE POLICIES CHOSEN BY CONSENSUS AND NON-CONSENSUS GROUPS 26

9. ORDER OF GROUPS OF STATEMENTS GIVEN TO EACH OF FIVE JUDGES 28

10. ORDER OF INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO EACH OF FIVE JUDGES FOR RATING DISCUSSION STATEMENTS ON SEVEN VARIABLES 28

11. RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR RATINGS OF SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES 31

12. RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE TOTAL RATINGS OF SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES FOR THE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL STUDY 32

13. CORRELATION MATRIX OF RATINGS OF EIGHT DISCUSSION VARIABLES 33

14. FACTOR STRUCTURE OF EIGHT DISCUSSION VARIABLES 34

15. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF CLARITY RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 35

16. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF OPINIONATEDNESS RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 36

17. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON OPINIONATEDNESS . . 37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

TABLE Page

18. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF INTEREST RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 38

19. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON INTEREST 38

20. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF AMOUNT OF INFORMATION RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 39

21. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON AMOUNT OF INFORMATION 40

22. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF PROVOCATIVENESS RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 40

23. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON PROVOCATIVENESS 41

24. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF ORIENTATION RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 42

25. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON ORIENTATION 43

26. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVITY RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 43

27. TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON OBJECTIVITY 44

28. CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF THE LENGTH OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS 45

29. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF DISCUSSION STATEMENTS ON EIGHT VARIABLES 46

30. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF DISCUSSION STATEMENTS FROM CONSENSUS AND NON-CONSENSUS GROUPS COMBINED 47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

TABLE Page

31. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS ON WOMEN'S HOURS 48

32. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS ON STUDENTS' POSSESSION OF CARS 49

33. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS ON GRADING 50

I-1. ANALYSES OF SEX DIFFERENCES 149

SUMMARY

Research in group communication has provided little information about consensus. This failure has been largely the result of experimentally oriented scholars' having concentrated on consensus as a predictor of other variables rather than on variables which may be predictive of consensus. This study attempted to identify variables which distinguish the statements of consensus groups from the statements of non-consensus groups and to determine if and how relationships between consecutive statements differ for the two types of groups.

Statements from discussions on three questions of policy by three consensus and three non-consensus groups were rated on clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length. The participants who discussed the questions, involving the University of Iowa's policies on undergraduate women's hours, undergraduates' possession of automobiles, and grading, were beginning rhetoric students. Each group was initially a non-consensus group, but one on each question reached consensus after an impromptu discussion. Fifty pairs of consecutive statements were selected from each group--the first member of each pair being chosen at random.

Two-factor analyses of variance were made, using the scores of the first statements in each pair on each of the eight variables, to determine if statements of consensus and non-consensus groups are distinguishable. No differences between the two types of groups were found on either clarity or length. Although no difference between the consensus and non-consensus groups discussing students' possession of automobiles and grading was found on opinionatedness, amount of information, provocativeness, and objectivity, the statements of the consensus group discussing women's hours were significantly less opinionated, more informative, more provocative, and more objective than those of the non-consensus group. The results on interest were the least consistent for any of the variables. On women's hours, the consensus group's statements manifested significantly more interest than those of the non-consensus group. On undergraduates' possession of automobiles, just the opposite result was obtained. The results on orientation were more uniform than on any other variable. The statements of the consensus groups on women's hours and grading were significantly higher on this attribute than the statements of the corresponding non-consensus groups. Differences in group composition and the type of question discussed may account for the inconsistent findings on most of the variables.

In addition to the analyses of variance, two types of contingency analyses were made. First the values of consecutive statements on the

same variable were correlated. Second, the values of consecutive statements were correlated for all possible combinations of the eight variables. These correlational analyses were to determine if the value of one statement is contingent upon the value of the preceding statement, either on the same variable or on other variables, and if the contingencies differ for consensus and non-consensus groups. For the first type of analysis, virtually no significant relationships between consecutive statements were found. For the second, a substantial number of significant relationships was found in the non-consensus groups, but they were inconsistent. In general, identifying relationships between consecutive statements did not appear to have been a sophisticated enough analysis to discover how patterns of communication for consensus and non-consensus groups differ.

Since statements of consensus groups were distinguishable from those of non-consensus groups (although not consistently) on six variables, we may be closer to understanding the factors which promote and inhibit consensus. Without more research, however, we shall remain largely ignorant about an important objective of group communication.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In Communication and the Small Group, Gerald M. Phillips points out that achieving consensus is an essential, if not the most essential, purpose of interpersonal communication.[1] This point of view has been underscored by a number of eminent scholars, including Baird,[2] McBurney and Hance,[3] and Keltner.[4] Despite its apparent importance as a goal in group communication, consensus remains a phenomenon about which very little is actually known. Only a small amount of research dealing with group communication has been directly concerned with consensus. Perhaps some of the reasons for our lack of knowledge about it will become evident from an analysis of previous research.

Previous Research

In recent years, behavioral scientists have developed an interest in group processes and communication but have told us very little about consensus or the conditions under which it is reached. Their failure to do so, however, is largely the result of simply not having studied the problem.

Social psychologists and sociologists primarily have been concerned with questions about the development of group norms, conformity, rejection, learning, role-playing, attitude formation, social facilitation, power, and interaction as functions of group membership and the kinds of communication which members of groups direct to one another. This is not to say that the knowledge gained from the study of such variables is irrelevant to our understanding of the phenomenon of consensus. In fact, such studies are sometimes suggestive of the possible reasons for a group's failure to reach consensus; however, these possibilities need specific testing.

In those psychological and sociological studies which have examined consensus, the emphasis has been on how it relates to other kinds of behaviors. Thus, it has typically been treated as an independent variable; that is, investigators have manipulated consensus to achieve differences in some other type of behavior, such as resistance to persuasion or perception of self. White, for example, found that changes in one's attitude toward a concept is related to his perception of a group's consensus.[5] Individuals who believed that a group was divided in its opinion on a particular concept were less likely to change their attitudes on the concept than individuals who believed that the group was unified in its opinion. Shelley discovered a rather interesting relationship between consensus on one issue and consensus on another. Groups of girls who had reached consensus about the status of members of their respective clubs were more likely to agree in their decisions concerning who ranked high in leadership than groups which had failed to reach consensus about the status of club members.[6]

In separate studies of group pressure, Asch[7] and Deutsch and Gerard[8] demonstrated that groups which appear to be in unanimous agreement are more likely to affect the judgment of a naive subject than groups which do not appear to be in unanimous agreement.

Investigating a different kind of problem from any of those mentioned above, Anderson and McGuire found that reassuring an individual about the validity of certain cultural truisms, by referring him to peer groups which had allegedly reached consensus, was less effective in building resistance to later persuasive messages than direct attacks on the truisms.[9]

In yet another kind of investigation, Backman, Secord, and Pierce found that an individual was more likely to change his perception of one of his personality traits when he was told that a group of "significant others" was divided in its belief that the subject possessed the trait than when he was told that the group unanimously agreed that he possessed the trait.[10] In other words, the consensus group seemed to instill greater resistance to change than the non-consensus group.

Perhaps of greater interest to people in speech than some of the previously mentioned research is a study by Bennett who had groups discuss a question about volunteering for psychological and sociological experiments. She found that the members of groups that reached consensus were more likely to act upon their decisions than the members of groups that had not reached consensus which is both an interesting and important finding.[11] The study, however, fails to yield any information about the processes involved in those discussions which terminated in consensus or about the communication behavior of the discussants.

Although much of the research mentioned up to this point is relevant to the establishment of psychological and sociological laws, in general, it does not yield the kind of information which is useful to speech scholars who are interested in discussion and group communication. In fact, it is largely irrelevant to the sorts of laws which communication scientists presumably seek to establish. In speech, one ostensibly would have a greater interest in the factors leading to consensus, considered as an outcome of group communication, than in the effects of consensus on other kinds of variables of psychological or sociological interest and importance.

Not all of the research dealing with the phenomenon of consensus is irrelevant to the kinds of interests which speech scholars have. Sharp and Milliken, for example, have studied the relationship between reflective thinking ability and the quality of group solutions in problem-solving discussions.[12] Nine sections of beginning speech students were divided into twenty-seven subgroups on the basis of reflective thinking ability as measured by Johnson's reflective thinking test.[13] All of a given subgroup's members were either high, medium, or low in reflective thinking ability. Each group discussed one of three problems and afterwards prepared a written report. Expert judges then ranked the reports in terms of their quality. As expected, the solutions developed by the groups high in reflective thinking ability were judged to have the highest quality. Sharp and Milliken believe that their experiment provides some objective support for the assumption that reflective thinking is essential or at least desirable in discussions of this type.[14]

A few studies in group communication have been specifically designed to identify variables related to consensus. Hare, for example, found in a study of boy scouts that larger groups failed to reach as high a level of agreement as smaller groups, thereby establishing size as a factor in the outcomes of group discussions.[15] Since Hare studied only groups having either five or twelve members, his results fail to indicate what the optimum size is for effective group discussion. He, nevertheless, has found something which, with some additional testing, could be valuable for both discussion teachers and group communication researchers.

In another study, Lott discovered that groups communicating under conditions of "perceived dissimilarity" achieved a higher degree of "objective (or actual) similarity" at the end of a discussion than groups communicating under conditions of "perceived similarity".[16] Four-man groups were told that they were either similar or dissimilar in their economic and aesthetic values. Ten groups were actually similar, and ten were not. The groups were then assigned to discuss questions involving economic and aesthetic values. Lott found that regardless of the actual degree of similarity in the economic and aesthetic values of the members of the groups, if the discussants believed that they were dissimilar before a discussion, they were actually more similar in their aesthetic and economic values than the groups whose members believed they were initially similar.

Studies such as those of Hare and Lott are of some interest to people in speech, but they tell us very little of the actual interpersonal communication that leads to consensus. This is not to minimize the contribution of such studies to research in group communication as a whole; nevertheless, they are of limited value to those who wish to understand certain aspects of the internal processes of group communication.

Research that comes much closer to shedding some light on the internal processes of group communication than most of that reviewed in this report is Riecken's study of the relationship between talkativeness and the individual's ability to influence group solutions to problems.[17] Riecken assigned thirty-two four-man groups of beginning psychology students the task of discussing the problem of what to do in a situation involving an employee who is continually disrupting the harmonious operation of an organization. Sixteen talkative and sixteen non-talkative participants, identified from two previous discussions, were assigned at random to the thirty-two groups. On the instruction sheet of each of these participants a "uniquely elegant' solution to the problem being discussed was provided. He was to introduce the solution in his discussion group, but was not to reveal that someone else had given him the solution. Riecken found that a significantly greater proportion of the talkative participants gained acceptance of their solution than the non-talkative participants. In addition, the naive participants indicated general satisfaction with the solution they had been given. Finally, Riecken found that when non-talkative participants gained acceptance of the solution, they did so with the assistance of a more talkative member of the group.

How generalizable Riecken's findings are is open to question. No indication of how concerned or ego-involved the psychology students were with the problem they were discussing is given in the report. If the subjects did not care about the problem and were not committed to a particular solution, then it seems reasonable that a highly talkative individual with a "uniquely elegant" solution could lead a group to consensus. Under a different set of circumstances, talkativeness could conceivably be a detriment rather than an aid to consensus.

Perhaps the most comprehensive study to date of the factors related to consensus in decision-making groups is the one by Guetzkow and Gyr.[18] These investigators studied ninety-seven business and governmental conferences having more than seven hundred participants. Their objective was to identify the conditions under which tension and conflict within a conference terminate in consensus and the conditions under which they do not. They identified two kinds of conflict, "Substantive" and "Affective." They defined substantive conflict as a form of intellectual opposition among discussants, and they defined affective conflict as a form of emotional clash.[19] Guetzkow and Gyr further considered consensus to be agreement, but not necessarily satisfaction, with a decision. In fact, after the investigation they found a correlation of only +.46 between agreement and satisfaction.[20]

All data analyzed in the study were collected from ratings by observers and interviews with participants. In total, Guetzkow and Gyr had nearly one hundred different measures of various aspects of the discussions which were observed; however, they found that nearly half of these were not helpful in the identification of factors which promote consensus.[21] In general, they discovered that while some factors promote consensus among groups in either type of conflict, there are other factors which depend strictly on the type of conflict.[22]

Guetzkow and Gyr also found that formal procedure was not related to consensus;[23] that is, groups which followed parliamentary procedure in attacking the problems which confronted them were no more likely to reach consensus than groups which failed to follow this procedure.

A study such as that conducted by Guetzkow and Gyr is certainly not without problems. The investigators, for example, grouped together what seem to be different kinds of consensus groups. One kind was the group whose members all agree to a decision and are also satisfied with the decision. The other kind was the group whose members agree to a decision but are not necessarily satisfied with the decision. Despite problems which may exist with the Guetzkow and Gyr study, their effort was entirely in the right direction.

Specific Purpose of the Study

The preceding review suggests that considerably more research needs to be done before one can fully understand the processes by which groups reach consensus. Although some progress has been made in the research efforts of Hare, Lott, Riecken, and Guetzkow and Gyr, much remains to be learned. The specific purpose of this study was to identify additional critical variables (that is, variables which distinguish one group from another) related to the phenomenon of consensus.

Focus of the Study

This study was an investigation which focused on consensus in discussions of questions of policy. Since so little is known about consensus, and since the amount of research on the phenomenon is quite small, it seemed more appropriate to conduct an investigation in the hope of being able to generate some hypotheses for future testing than to conduct an experiment, the hypotheses for which would have little or no foundation. Limiting the study to discussions of questions of policy was necessitated by the almost unlimited number of group communication situations that exist and by the inability of one study to deal adequately with all of them. In addition, discussions of policy are among the main types in which people in speech have their students engage.

Before one can systematically study a variable such as consensus, he must be able to define it operationally. Generally speaking, authorities such as Gulley,[24] Phillips,[25] Harnack and Fest,[26] and Barnlund and Haiman[27] are agreed that consensus refers to agreement among the members of a group which is reached without the formality of voting. For purposes of this study, consensus referred to unanimous agreement by the members of a group discussing a question of policy on a single policy. This definition seemed to be in keeping with what the authorities cited above mean by the term consensus. Because of the possibility that no groups would actually reach consensus, I was prepared to study the discussions of groups which closely approached consensus. Fortunately, this problem did not arise.

Variables Investigated in the Study

The specific variables examined in this study were as follows: (1) Clarity of Expression, (2) Opinionatedness, (3) Interest, (4) Amount of Information, (5) Provocativeness, (6) Orientation, (7) Objectivity, and (8) Length of Contribution. The bases on which these particular variables were selected for study are explained in detail in Chapter II as is the method of quantifying them. In general, however, with the exception of length, each of the variables--clarity, opinionatedness, etc.--was quantified by having raters judge the extent to which individual discussion statements exhibited the property in question.

Major Questions Addressed by the Study

This investigation attempted to deal with two major questions:

1. Are the statements (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) of groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus distinguishable from the statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?

2. Are the relationships (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) between consecutive statements of discussion groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus different from the relationships between consecutive statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?

The reason for attempting to answer the first of these questions should be obvious from both the review of research on consensus and from my earlier statement concerning the specific purpose of the study. The rationale for dealing with the second question may not be clear, however. To discover what contingencies, if any, exist among statements in group discussions is to have discovered something meaningful about the process of group communication. At present, our knowledge of process in group communication is very limited.

Perhaps the major contribution to the study of process in group communication to date is Bales' method of interaction process analysis.[28] Bales developed twelve categories which observers can use to classify contributions of individual participants engaged in group communication. On the basis of the classification of contributions, it is possible to develop profiles of various kinds of group communication.

Bales' system for studying process suffers in at least two important respects. First, fitting a statement into one of the twelve categories precludes looking at it in other ways. Many statements made in a group discussion are multidimensional; that is, they serve several functions and could be classified in a variety of ways. Second, and perhaps more important, Bales' system does not lead itself to precise statistical analysis. One can determine the relative proportions of certain kinds of statements in different kinds of discussions, but he cannot determine with much precision how different one group is from another.

This study attempted to overcome the weaknesses of Bales' method of process analysis by looking at statements in eight different ways and by assigning ratings to statements in such a way that they would be more conducive to precise statistical analysis.

To identify variables which consistently distinguish consensus groups from non-consensus groups and to uncover relationships between consecutive statements that are different for consensus and non-consensus groups would be to acquire knowledge that is both theoretically significant and potentially practical. The method which I employed in attempting to obtain these kinds of information is the subject of the next chapter.

REFERENCES

1. Gerald M. Phillips, *Communication and the Small Group* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966), p. 39.

2. A. Craig Baird, *Public Discussion and Debate* (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1937), p. 359.

3. James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *Discussion in Human Affairs* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 14.

4. John W. Keltner, *Group Discussion Processes* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1957), p. 192.

5. Martha F. White, "Attitude Change as Related to Perceived Group Consensus" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954).

6. Harry P. Shelley, "Status Consensus, Leadership, and Satisfaction with the Group," *Journal of Social Psychology*, LI(1960, 157-164.

7. S. E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*, ed. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960), pp. 189-200.

8. Morton Deutsch and Harold B. Gerard, "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences upon Individual Judgment," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LI(1955), pp. 629-636.

9. Lynn R. Anderson and William J. McGuire, "Prior Reassurance of Group Consensus as a Factor in Producing Resistance to Persuasion," *Sociometry*, XXVIII(1965), 46-56.

10. C. W. Backman, P. F. Secord, and J. R. Pierce, "Resistance to Change in the Self-Concept as a Function of Consensus Among Significant Others," *Sociometry*, XXVI(1963), 102-11.

11. Edith Bennett, "Discussion, Decision Commitment, and Consensus in 'Group Decision,'" Human Relations, VIII(1955), 254-274.

12. Harry Sharp, Jr. and Joyce Milliken, "Reflective Thinking Ability and the Product of Problem-Solving Discussion," Speech Monographs, XXXI(1964), 124-127.

13. Alma Johnson, "An Experimental Study in the Analysis and Measurement of Reflective Thinking," Speech Monographs, X(1943), 83-96.

14. Sharp and Milliken, p. 124.

15. Paul A Hare, "A Study of Interaction and Consensus in Different Sized Groups," American Sociological Review, XVII(1952), 261-267.

16. John A. Lott, "Group Composition, Communication, and Consensus: An Investigation According to Newcomb's Theory of Communication" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1959).

17. Henry W. Riecken, "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions to Problems," Sociometry, XXI(1958), 309-321.

18. Harold Guetzkow and John Gyr, "An Analysis of Conflict in Decision-Making Groups," Human Relations, VII(1954), 367-382.

19. Ibid., p. 380.

20. Ibid., p. 371.

21. Ibid., pp. 374-377.

22. Ibid., pp. 380-381.

23. Ibid.

24. Halbert E. Gulley, Discussion, Conference, and Group Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 281.

25. Phillips, p. 7.

26. R. V. Harnack and T. B. Fest, Group Discussion: Theory and Technique (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964), p. 338.

27. D. C. Barnlund and F. S. Haiman, The Dynamics of Discussion (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960), p. 46.

28. R. F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1950).

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Preliminary Analysis

Selection of the Variables of the Study

A broad survey of literature in group communication enabled me to select sixteen variables, the absence or presence of which in a discussion could conceivably facilitate or impede a group's attempt to reach consensus. Although I consulted many sources, I was guided primarily in my selection of the variables by analyses of communication behavior in writings by McBurney and Hance,[1] Gulley,[2] Barnlund and Haiman,[3] Harnack and Fest,[4] Bales,[5] and Phillips.[6] The variables chosen for study were (1) provocativeness, (2) amount of information, (3) relevance, (4) clarity, (5) emotionality, (6) competence, (7) friendliness, (8) opinionatedness, (9) cooperativeness, (10) redundancy, (11) objectivity, (12) orientation, (13) level of agreement, (14) interest, (15) controversy, and (16) length of contribution.

Method of Quantifying Variables

Quantifying the variables identified above in such a manner that they could be analyzed statistically was essential for the investigation. I decided to deal with this problem by having judges rate discussion statements on each of the variables I wished to study.

One of the problems in small group research which limits the use of many statistical procedures is the number of people with whom an investigator typically has to work. In order to study the variables in which he is interested, a researcher is often forced to use large numbers of groups. The advantage of using statements rather than individuals as the unit of analysis is that one can use a small number of groups and still be able to detect reliable differences among them. In addition to the efficiency of using statements rather than individuals, this procedure has the added advantage of enabling one more nearly to make maximum use of the content of the discussions he is studying.

That properties of the type under consideration could be reliably measured was, of course, a major concern in designing the study. Nichols found in a recent investigation that audiences could reliably rate "naturalness" in both spoken and written sentences,[7] and Bowers found that the property of language intensity could be reliably rated.[8]

Although neither of these studies was concerned with any of the variables involved in this investigation, they, nevertheless, indicated that the kind of variables being studied could be reliably measured.

After the method of quantifying the variables was determined, each was operationally defined as follows:

1. Provocativeness. A statement is said to be provocative if it reflects a desire or willingness on the part of its maker to have another person make an overt response to it; that is, it seems to invite or welcome responses.

2. Amount of Information. A statement is said to be informative if it contains facts, statistics, and opinions of qualified sources which bear directly on some aspect of the question being discussed.

3. Relevance. A relevant contribution is one which bears directly on the question or issue being discussed by the members of a group.

4. Clarity. A statement is said to be clear when an individual hearing or reading it feels confident that he understands what its maker means.

5. Emotionality. A statement is said to be emotional if it reflects strong feelings on the part of its maker toward some other person, object, or concept.

6. Competence. A statement is said to be the remark of a competent person if it reflects not only his ability to present facts and opinions but also to interpret and use them in support of an assertion.

7. Friendliness. A statement is said to be friendly when it reflects a desire on the part of its maker to establish good relations with another person or persons.

8. Opinionatedness. A statement is said to be opinionated when it expresses a feeling, belief, or judgment, the factual basis for which is not apparent in the statement itself.

9. Cooperativeness. An individual is said to be cooperative if his statements reflect a willingness to work with others.

10. Redundancy. A statement is said to be redundant if it uses more language than necessary to express the basic idea which it contains.

11. Objectivity. A statement is said to be objective when it reflects freedom from conscious attempts on the part of its maker to persuade or otherwise influence another person or persons toward his point of view.

12. Orientation. A statement is said to give orientation if it reflects an attempt on the part of its maker to facilitate achievement of a group's goal by using facts, making helpful suggestions, or trying to resolve conflict.

13. Level of Agreement. A statement is said to reflect agreement on the part of its maker if it has some indication that he is willing to share or, in fact, does share an opinion, belief, judgment, or conclusion with some other person or persons.

14. Interest. A statement is said to reflect the interest of its maker if it contains some indication of concern or involvement on his part with the question being discussed.

15. Controversy. A statement is said to be controversial if it is possible to disagree with it.

16. Length. Length is simply the number of words in a statement.

Method of Selecting Final List of Variables

Reliability of judgments and independence of the variables were the two criteria used in selecting from the list of sixteen variables those which would be used in the major part of the investigation. If any variable could not be reliably rated, then the values assigned to individual statements would approach complete randomness, and the chances for detecting differences between consensus and non-consensus groups would be minimal. In addition, if any of the variables correlated highly with others in the list, then it would be somewhat pointless to treat them as fundamentally different variables. In other words, knowledge about one variable would provide adequate knowledge about the others with which it was highly correlated.

To determine which of the sixteen variables best satisfied the criteria of reliability and independence and which, therefore, would be used in the study required a preliminary investigation. Ten statements were selected at random and transcribed from a recording of each of five discussions. I defined a statement as the continuous flow of language of a participant to the point at which another participant initiates a continuous flow of language and the first participant discontinues his flow of language. The participants whose statements were used were students from the beginning course in discussion offered at the University of Iowa. Each of the discussions dealt with a question of policy on one of the following topics: (1) Birth Control on the University of Iowa Campus; (2) The University of Iowa's Policy on Women's Hours; (3) The University of Iowa's Parking Problem; (4) The Role of the University in the Student's Non-Academic Life, and (5) The United States' Selective Service Policy. A copy of the fifty statements used in the preliminary investigation may be found in Appendix A.

With the exception of length, groups having either four or five rhetoric students from the University of Iowa each judged the fifty statements on a different variable. The total number of judges involved was seventy. Ten of the variables were each rated by groups of five judges while the remaining five were each rated by groups of four judges. Having fewer judges for some of the variables was primarily the result of absenteeism on the days the rating was being done. The judges were beginning rhetoric students at the University of Iowa. Seventy-five of them were originally scheduled to rate statements, but four were absent from class on those days when the judging took place.[9] One student's ratings could not be used because of his failure to follow directions.

The students who rated the statements had no previous experience with the task they were asked to perform. Each was given a set of instructions explaining how to make his ratings. The instructions for judging each of the variables were written in the same form. First, an explanation of the task was given. Second, the variable in question was defined. Third, the extremes and the midpoint on a seven-point rating scale were identified and defined. Fourth, the judge was told how to use the remaining points on the scale. Fifth, three examples of statements and how they might be rated were presented.

Determining the length of each contribution did not require the use of judges. I used the following criteria for this task:

1. All contractions were counted as one word.
2. Part-words were not counted as words. "Don Don't," for example, would be counted as only one word.
3. Vocalized pauses of the ah or uh type were not counted as words.
4. Proper names were counted as one word.
5. Numbers were counted as one word.

After the rating was completed, a score on each of the variables was assigned to every statement. For every variable except length an individual score was the sum of the judges' ratings. For the variables retained, I intended to use this total value in all analyses made in the major part of the study. To determine the reliability of the individual ratings on each variable and the reliability of the sum of all judges' ratings on each variable, I employed Ebel's method for estimating the reliability of ratings.[10] The reliability coefficients for all of the variables except length (the values for which were determined by counting words) are presented in Table 1.

Examination of Table 1 reveals that the combined judges' ratings provide a more reliable measure of each of the variables than the individual ratings. The reliability coefficients for the combined judges' ratings ranged from a low of .375 to a high of .862. For ten of the variables, the reliability of the combined judges' ratings was in excess of .500.

After the reliability of the ratings was determined, the total score for each of the statements on each of the variables was used in a factor analysis, the purpose of which was to identify how independent the variables were. A computer program based on Harman's suggested procedure for factor analysis was used for this portion of the study.[11] Table 2 presents the factor structure.

TABLE 1

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR RATINGS
OF FIFTEEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES

	Variable	Number of Judges	Reliability of Individual Ratings	Reliability of Combined Ratings
1.	Provocativeness	5	.335	.672
2.	Amount of Information	4	.675	.862
3.	Relevance	5	.342	.686
4.	Clarity	5	.518	.811
5.	Emotionality	5	.298	.629
6.	Competence	5	.228	.541
7.	Friendliness	4	.318	.583
8.	Opinionatedness	5	.335	.668
9.	Cooperativeness	5	.181	.469
10.	Redundancy	4	.321	.586
11.	Objectivity	4	.214	.450
12.	Orientation	5	.357	.690
13.	Agreement	4	.167	.375
14.	Interest	5	.402	.729
15.	Controversy	5	.178	.418

The three factors presented in Table 2 accounted for only 54.8 percent of the total variance in the ratings of the discussion statements, with Factor I accounting for 31.6 percent, Factor II for 13.7 percent, and Factor III for 9.5 percent. This means, of course, that a fairly substantial proportion of the total variance in the ratings on each of the variables is independent of the variance on the other variables. An inspection of the communalities (column headed h^2 in Table 2) shows that no single variable had more than 67 percent of its variance accounted for by the three factors.

Although the factor structure did not seem to provide a completely satisfactory basis for narrowing the list of variables to a more manageable size, it was useful in helping me to make rough groupings of

TABLE 2

FACTOR STRUCTURE OF SIXTEEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	h^2
1. Provocativeness	.13	.34	-.50	.38
2. Information	-.03	-.53	-.62	.67
3. Relevance	.25	-.39	-.61	.59
4. Clarity	.06	.03	-.74	.56
5. Emotionality	-.15	-.71	-.15	.55
6. Competence	.43	-.25	-.57	.57
7. Friendliness	.74	-.24	.01	.60
8. Opinionatedness	.06	-.66	.02	.44
9. Cooperativeness	.75	-.07	-.22	.61
10. Redundancy	.21	-.73	.23	.62
11. Objectivity	.70	.23	-.02	.54
12. Orientation	.63	-.14	-.45	.62
13. Agreement	.56	-.24	-.10	.38
14. Interest	.44	-.65	-.23	.66
15. Controversy	.33	-.49	-.09	.35
16. Length	.17	-.70	-.24	.58

the variables. Friendliness, cooperativeness, objectivity, orientation, and agreement had their highest loadings on Factor I; that is, they seemed to fit better along this particular dimension than along either of the others, and in this sense, they were more like one another than they were like any of the remaining variables. Emotionality, opinionatedness, redundancy, interest, controversy, and length had their highest loadings on Factor II, while provocativeness, amount of information, relevance, clarity, and competence had their highest loadings on Factor III.

Using both the factor data and the reliability data in Tables 2 and 1 as guides, for the final list I selected orientation and objectivity from the variables having their highest loadings on Factor I. Opinionatedness, interest, and length were selected from the variables having their highest loadings on Factor II, while provocativeness, amount of information, and clarity were selected from the variables having their highest loadings on Factor III.

Eight variables is a cumbersome number to manage in a single study. Because the purpose of the study was to identify variables which distinguish consensus groups from non-consensus groups, however, it seemed both necessary and desirable to obtain as much information as was practical.

Selection of Groups

Securing Cooperation

Obtaining the right kinds of groups was the next major step in the study. I began this phase of the project by sending a letter asking for assistance to instructors who teach beginning rhetoric at the University of Iowa. The letter explained the purpose of the study and the kind of assistance required. Of the instructors contacted, seventeen having thirty classes among them agreed to allow their students to participate.

Each of the cooperating instructors was again contacted about a time at which it would be convenient to administer a questionnaire to his students. The questionnaire results were to be used as a basis for selecting students to participate in discussions and for deciding which questions they would discuss. As soon as an instructor and I could agree on a satisfactory time to distribute the questionnaire, a visit to the participating class was scheduled.

The Initial Questionnaire

A questionnaire containing six questions of policy, which were presumably of some interest to beginning rhetoric students and which could be discussed without preparation, was developed. The following questions were included:

1. What should be the University's policy on housing for undergraduates?
2. What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?
3. What should be the University's policy on the acquisition and distribution of undergraduate textbooks?
4. What should be the role of students in the Administration's decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members?
5. What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?
6. What should be the University's policy on grading?

Following every question were six possible responses, the first of which was the present policy. The next four choices represented increasingly liberal departures from the present policy. The final response was open-ended for those students who found none of the others to be acceptable. In addition, beneath the six possible responses appeared a seven-point belief scale on which a subject was asked to indicate how strongly he believed in his choice. Although the entire questionnaire is included in Appendix B, an example of one question is presented below.

1. What should be the University's policy on housing for undergraduates?

_____ A. Under the present policy, unmarried undergraduates less than 21 years old must live either in dormitories or in "approved housing." This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. The essentials of the present policy should be maintained, but the list of "approved housing" should be expanded.
_____ C. Female undergraduates should be under the present policy, but male undergraduates should be allowed to live wherever they wish.
_____ D. The essentials of the present policy should be maintained, but undergraduates should be permitted to live wherever they wish with parental approval.
_____ E. All undergraduates should be allowed to live wherever they wish.
_____ F. Other (Please Specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

A set of instructions was attached to each questionnaire. In the instructions the respondents were told how to record their answers to the questionnaire items, and they were given a worked example. They were also informed in the instructions that the results would be used to select six members of each cooperating class to participate in a discussion at some later time. Finally, the students were assured that participation in the project would in no way influence their grades. A copy of the instruction sheet is included in Appendix C.

Questionnaire Results

Because of the problems involved in finding suitable times for recording discussions, it was necessary to decide which questions would be discussed and to begin recording sessions before all thirty groups had completed the questionnaire. The questions for discussion were selected on the basis of returns from twenty-three classes. Table 3 contains a summary of the frequency and percentage of responses to each choice for all six items in the questionnaire.

Question 4 was rejected immediately because no one responded to choice E. One of my criteria for selecting discussants was that three members of each group choose the most liberal position on the question they would be assigned. For this reason, Question 4 could not be used. Although a small number responded to choice E on Question 3, it was also rejected for the same reason. Since I had decided in designing the study to use only three questions, one more had to be eliminated. Any

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO THE CHOICES FOR EACH ITEM ON A SIX-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Policy on Housing

Choice	f	%
A	58	13.1
B	68	15.4
C	26	5.9
D	212	48.0
E	63	14.3
F	15	3.4

2. Policy on Women's Hours

Choice	f	%
A	85	19.8
B	46	10.7
C	169	39.1
D	16	3.7
E	72	16.7
F	42	9.9

3. Policy on Textbooks

Choice	f	%
A	74	16.7
B	137	30.9
C	153	34.5
D	54	12.2
E	12	2.7
F	13	2.9

4. Students' Role in Retention of Faculty

Choice	f	%
A	87	19.7
B	224	50.7
C	110	24.9
D	13	2.9
E	0	0.0
F	8	1.8

5. Policy on Automobiles

Choice	f	%
A	130	29.1
B	49	11.0
C	92	20.6
D	98	22.0
E	53	11.9
F	24	5.4

6. Policy on Grading

Choice	f	%
A	184	42.2
B	62	14.2
C	81	18.6
D	42	9.6
E	45	10.3
F	22	5.0

of the four remaining questions would have been satisfactory for the study; therefore, I arbitrarily discarded Question 1.

Selecting Participants for Discussions

Although they could not be satisfied in every case, four criteria were used as guides in selecting students from the rhetoric classes to participate in discussions:

1. Each group should have six members.
2. Three members of each group should have endorsed the present policy on the question they would be assigned to discuss, and three should have endorsed the most liberal policy. (This precaution was taken to insure that any group whose discussion terminated in consensus was not a consensus group prior to the discussion and that any group whose discussion terminated in non-consensus was initially a non-consensus group.)
3. Each group should have three male and three female participants.
4. All members of the same sex in a given group should not have endorsed the same policy prior to their discussion.

Thirty groups of six students were selected from the cooperating rhetoric classes. Ten groups were tentatively scheduled to discuss the question on women's hours, ten were tentatively scheduled to discuss the question on automobiles, and the remaining ten were tentatively scheduled to discuss the question on the University's grading policy. Table 4 contains information concerning the composition of the thirty groups.[12] In the column headed Policies Chosen, each letter represents the policy endorsed by a given member of the group on the initial questionnaire.

After the groups were tentatively scheduled to discuss their questions, the rhetoric instructors were contacted once again. They were given the names of the six students who were being invited to participate in one of the forthcoming discussions. In addition, the names of two alternates, one for the conservative members of the group and one for the liberal members of the group, were included in the event that someone could not be present on the day of the scheduled discussion. The instructors were told to inform their students of the time and place of their discussions. They were also told that immediately after each discussion the students would be informed of the reasons for their participation in the investigation.

Both the participating students' instructors and I assured the discussants that their involvement in the project would not influence their grades in rhetoric. In addition, all discussions were scheduled during periods in which the members of a class were giving speeches; consequently, no student had to miss a lecture or other class work in order to participate.

TABLE 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS ASSIGNED TO DISCUSS THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Question: What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

Group	Number	Policies Chosen	Sex
1	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMF
2	6	AAAEEE	FFMFFM
3	6	AAAEED	FFMMMF
4	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
5	6	AAAEEE	FFFMMM
6	6	AAAEEE	MMMFFF
7	6	AABEEE	FFMMMF
8	6	AAAEEE	FMMMMM
9	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
10	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMM

Question: What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?

Group	Number	Policies Chosen	Sex
1	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
2	6	ABAEEE	FFMMMM
3	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMM
4	6	AAAEEE	FFFMMM
5	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMF
6	6	AAAEEE	FFFMMM
7	6	AAAEDD	MFFFMM
8	6	AAAEEE	MFFFMM
9	6	AAAEED	MMFFFM
10	6	AAAEDD	FFMFFM

Question: What should be the University's policy on grading?

Group	Number	Policies Chosen	Sex
1	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
2	6	AAAEEE	FFFMMM
3	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMF

TABLE 4 (CONT'D.)

4	6	AAAEED	MFFMMF
5	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
6	6	AAAEEE	MMMFFF
7	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
8	6	AAAEEE	MMFFFM
9	6	AAACED	MMFMMF
10	6	AAAEEE	FFMMMF

Conducting the Discussions

The same basic procedure was followed for every discussion. On the day a discussion was to be held, I (or in two instances a fellow graduate student) met the discussants in the main office of the University of Iowa's Television Center. As the students arrived, their names were checked to determine if any of the alternates had been substituted. The students were then escorted to one of the practice rooms in the basement of the Television Center where a table and a semi-circle of six chairs had been set up earlier in the day.

After they were seated, the students were told that they were being asked to participate in an impromptu discussion on a question in which many of the students at the University had shown a great deal of interest. Because amount of preparation was a variable which could have an effect on the outcomes of the discussions, and because I had no other way of controlling it, the participants were given no information in advance of the discussion about the question with which they were to deal. Every group was told that the discussion would be recorded for subsequent analysis of the issues which arose.

Each participant was given a set of instructions and a suggested discussion agenda to follow. The instructions included a statement introducing the investigator and a statement providing a rationale for the discussion, which was that the results of the discussion could have implications for future policy. The instructions further specified that the group's objective was to come to a decision on the most satisfactory solution to the problem they were discussing but that achieving complete agreement was by no means mandatory. Finally, the participants were instructed not to leave the room if they should happen to finish their discussion before I returned.

Following the instructions was a statement of the question to be discussed, a description of the present policy, and a list of four other policies which the group might wish to consider. An example is provided below:

> QUESTION: What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

Under the present policy, most undergraduate women must be in their housing units by midnight from Sunday through Thursday and by 1 A.M. on Friday and Saturday nights. However, Juniors and Seniors may be exempted from these regulations with parental approval, and all undergraduate women at least 21 years old are exempted. Some possible alternatives to the present policy include:

1. maintaining the present policy for Freshmen and Sophomores, but exempting Juniors and Seniors without parental approval,
2. maintaining the present policy for Freshmen, exempting Sophomores with parental approval, but exempting Juniors and Seniors without parental approval,
3. allowing each women's housing unit to make its own rules concerning hours,
4. abolishing hours for undergraduate women.

The sets of instructions and the agenda given to each of the participants are included in Appendices C and D.

After the instructions and agenda were distributed, and the tape recorder was switched on, I told the students that I was leaving but would return about ten minutes before the end of the period. This precaution was taken so that the groups would not be inhibited in their discussions by the presence of a relative stranger. After I left the room, the students began to discuss their question. When each discussion was finished, I returned and distributed a new questionnaire to the participants. Upon completing the questionnaire, they were given an opportunity to ask questions.

The Final Questionnaire

The questionnaire which the participants answered after their discussions was much like the one which had been used initially. It was different in two essential respects, however. First, it contained only the three questions which the groups were asked to discuss, and, second, the choices were in a new order. What had been choice B for each item in the initial questionnaire was now choice E. Choice C was changed to D, D to C, and E to B. In other words, with the exception of choices A and F, the arrangement of possible responses was in reverse order from the arrangement on the initial questionnaire.[13] Choice A was not changed because it contained a description of the present policy, and it seemed pointless to describe the present policy after specifying possible departures from it. Choice F, the open-ended response, also remained as it appeared on the initial questionnaire because, again, it seemed pointless to call for new policies until those which were specifically stated had been considered. A copy of the final questionnaire may be found in Appendix E, but for purposes of illustrating the rearrangement of choices, the following example has been provided:

1. What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

_____ A. Under the present policy, most undergraduate women must be in their housing units by midnight from Sunday through Thursday and by 1 A.M. on Friday and Saturday nights. However, Juniors and Seniors may be exempted from these regulations with parental approval. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. No undergraduate women should have hours.
_____ C. Each women's housing unit should make its own rules concerning hours.
_____ D. The present policy should be maintained for Freshmen, Sophomores should be exempted with parental approval, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ E. The present policy should be maintained for Freshmen and Sophomores, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ F. Other (Please Specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

Results of the Discussions

Of the original thirty groups, the discussions of six were considered unusable because not all of the students who were asked to participate were present. One discussion was lost because the record button on the tape recorder was not set properly, and another discussion never materialized. The instructor and I could not find a suitable time to schedule it.

Eight of the remaining twenty-two groups either reached or closely approached consensus, eight moved a moderate distance toward consensus, and six showed little or no movement toward consensus. To determine the extent to which each group approached consensus, the number of positions actually moved by the discussants toward one another was compared to the total number of positions it was possible for them to move toward one another. The results are presented in Table 5.

Method of Selecting the Final Six Groups

The design of the study called for the use of three consensus and three non-consensus groups, one of each type having discussed the same question. Fourteen groups were potentially usable: five on the first question (women's hours), four on the second question (undergraduates' possession of automobiles), and five on the third question (grading).

TABLE 5

MOVEMENT TOWARD CONSENSUS IN TWENTY-TWO GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Question: What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

Group	Initial Position	Final Position	Actual Movement / Possible Movement
1*	AAAEEE	CCCCCC	1.000
2*	AABEEE	AAEEEE	.273
3	AAAEED	AAADDD	.182
4	AAAEEE	CECEEC	.667
5	AAAEEE	BCAEEE	.250
6	AAAEEE	CCCCCC	1.000

Question: What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?

Group	Initial Position	Final Position	Actual Movement / Possible Movement
1*	AAAEEE	AAAAAA	1.000
2*	AAACDE	AAAAED	.222
3	AAAEDD	EDDDEE	.789
4	ABAEEE	EDDEDE	.909
5	AAAEEE	EEEEEE	1.000
6	AAAEEE	EEAEDD	.667
7	AAAEED	AAAADA	.727
8	AAAEDD	EDDEED	.789

Question: What should be the University's policy on grading?

Group	Initial Position	Final Position	Actual Movement / Possible Movement
1*	AAAEEE	BBBBBB	1.000
2*	AAAEEE	ABEEEE	.417
3	AAAEEE	AAAEEE	.000
4	AAAEED	BCBDBB	.818
5	AAACED	CCCDDD	.600

6	AAAEEE	DDADDD	.750
7	AAAEEE	CBCBCC	.750
8	AAAEEE	FFFFFF	1.000

* Chosen as one of the final six groups

In each discussion, the total number of statements was counted. If this number was less than one hundred, the discussion was discarded. Two consensus groups and one non-consensus group were excluded for this reason. One non-consensus group was excluded from the sample because it lasted less than twenty minutes while the remaining discussions were approximately thirty minutes each. Finally four groups were omitted from the sample because they had not quite achieved consensus.

The characteristics of the six groups chosen for final study are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS CHOSEN FOR STUDY

Question	Type of Group	Actual Movement / Possible Movement	Sex	Number of Statements
Hours	C	1.000	FMMMMM	176
Hours	NC	.273	FFMMMF	245
Cars	C	1.000	MMFMFF	197
Cars	NC	.222	MMMFMM	173
Grades	C	1.000	FFMFFM	190
Grades	NC	.417	FFFMMM	150

The six groups which were selected were not as similar in their composition as I had hoped they would be. Two groups, for example, had five male participants and only one female participant. However, other considerations which, at the time, seemed to be more important than the sex distributions of the groups, dictated the choice of these particular ones over others.

Since the members of each group had expressed their opinions on all three questions (even though each had discussed only one of them), the additional information was used to compare changes on the question which each group had discussed with changes on the questions which it had not discussed. One would expect change in the consensus groups to be greater on the question each discussed than on the questions they did not discuss, and he would also expect change in the non-consensus groups to be little, if any, greater on the question each discussed than on the questions they did not discuss. Table 7 contains a breakdown of the total number of positions which each group moved on each question between the times of the initial and final questionnaires.

Inspection of Table 7 reveals that the consensus groups changed substantially more on the questions which they discussed than on the questions they had not discussed. The non-consensus groups, however, changed only about as much on the questions which they had discussed as on the questions they had not discussed. Such change as was observed could reasonably be attributed to chance.

TABLE 7

CHANGES IN POSITIONS ON THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY BY SIX DISCUSSION GROUPS

Type of Group	Number of Positions Moved		
Consensus on	Hours	Cars	Grades
Hours	12	5	4
Cars	2	12	4
Grades	5	6	12
Non-Consensus on	Hours	Cars	Grades
Hours	3	2	4
Cars	2	2	2
Grades	3	0	5

One additional analysis of the questionnaire results was made. Although all of the members of a group could agree to accept the same policy after a discussion, they might not believe as strongly in the new policy as in the ones they advocated prior to the discussion. To test this possibility, the data collected from the strength of belief scales on the initial and final questionnaires were analyzed for both consensus and non-consensus groups. A difference score in strength of belief was computed for each individual on the question which he discussed. The difference scores were obtained simply by subtracting the strength of belief score on a given item on the initial questionnaire from the score on the corresponding item on the final questionnaire. The t-test appropriate for difference scores[14] was used in examining the mean changes in strength of belief for the consensus and non-consensus groups. Table 8 contains the test results.

TABLE 8

t-TESTS OF CHANGES IN STRENGTH OF BELIEF ON THE POLICIES CHOSEN BY CONSENSUS AND NON-CONSENSUS GROUPS

Type of Group	Mean Change	s_D	n	t
Consensus	1.11	1.81	18	2.48*
Non-Consensus	.33	1.70	18	.81

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence

The results above indicate that the consensus groups believed even more strongly in the policies which they chose after their discussion than in the ones they had chosen before; however, the non-consensus groups experienced no significant change.

I now felt that the six groups which I had selected were acceptable for further study. I proceeded to select statements from each of the discussions and prepared the materials necessary for rating them.

Selecting Statements from the Discussions

Fifty pairs of statements from each discussion were selected. The first member of each pair was chosen at random. In making the selections from each discussion, I counted the total number of statements and used a table of random numbers to choose fifty. The second member of each pair was the statement which immediately followed the first in a discussion. The first member of each pair of statements was to be used in the analyses of variance which I had planned in the hope of being able to identify which of the eight variables distinguish consensus groups from non-consensus groups. The second member of each pair would be used in the contingency analyses which were discussed in Chapter I. Once the pairs of statements were identified and located, they were transcribed from the tapes on which the discussions had been recorded.

Preparation of Judging Materials

When all of the transcriptions had been completed, the statements selected from each discussion were typed and prepared for judging. For the set from each discussion, statements 1 through 50 were the first members of the pairs of statements. They were kept in chronological order. Statements 51 through 100 were the second members of the pairs of statements. In other words, statements 1 and 51 were a pair, 2 and 52 were a pair, etc. This precaution was taken to prevent possible bias from judging each pair of statements as a pair rather than as individual statements.

One additional comment about the preparation of the statements for judging needs to be made. When, in my opinion, a statement in isolation could refer to many different things but did not in the discussion from which it was taken, I enclosed a brief descriptive phrase in brackets after the statement. Approximately half of the statements were treated in this manner. My purpose was to help the judges make both more reliable and more accurate evaluations.

After the statements were prepared for judging, they were given to five graduate students in speech at the University of Iowa who agreed to rate them. Each judge received the following materials: (1) a set of general instructions, (2) instructions for judging discussion statements on clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, and objectivity, (3) copies of the instructions and agenda given to each of the discussion groups, (4) a set of one hundred statements from each of the six discussions, and (5) a set of rating sheets on which he was to record his judgments. The general instructions contained information about the kinds of groups from which the statements had been selected and about the correct procedure for recording judgments. The instructions for judging the individual variables were almost identical to those given to the raters in the preliminary study. In fact, only two items, the number of statements to be judged and the number of groups from which they were taken, were changed on each instruction sheet. Copies of the general instructions, the instructions for judging each variable, and the statements may be found in Appendices F, G, and H.

The judges were asked to rate all six hundred statements on one variable at a time. Because of the possibility of order effects, each judge's materials were arranged differently both in terms of the rank order of each group of statements and the order of variables. Table 9 shows the order in which each judge received his statements, and Table 10 shows the order in which he received his instructions for judging the statements on each of the variables.

Table 9 shows that no judge received his set of statements in the same rank order. In addition, it shows that no judge rated statements from the same type of group or on the same question consecutively.

TABLE 9

ORDER OF GROUPS OF STATEMENTS GIVEN TO EACH OF FIVE JUDGES

Groups of Statements	Order of Groups by Judges				
	A	B	C	D	E
1. Consensus on Hours	2	3	4	5	6
2. Non-Consensus on Cars	3	4	5	6	1
3. Consensus on Grades	4	5	6	1	2
4. Non-Consensus on Hours	5	6	1	2	3
5. Consensus on Cars	6	1	2	3	4
6. Non-Consensus on Grades	1	2	3	4	5

TABLE 10

ORDER OF INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO EACH OF FIVE JUDGES FOR RATING DISCUSSION STATEMENTS ON SEVEN VARIABLES

Variables	Order of Variables by Judges				
	A	B	C	D	E
1. Clarity	2	3	4	5	6
2. Opinionatedness	3	4	5	6	7
3. Interest	4	5	6	7	1
4. Amount of Information	5	6	7	1	2
5. Provocativeness	6	7	1	2	3
6. Orientation	7	1	2	3	4
7. Objectivity	1	2	3	4	5

While the judges were making their ratings, I determined the length of each statement by counting individual words. I employed the same criteria that I used in the preliminary study to determine the length of individual contributions.

After the judges had completed their ratings, the data were put in their proper order and transferred to IBM cards. (A copy of the raw scores as they appear on the IBM cards is on file in the University of Iowa's Communication Research Laboratory.) A total score for each statement on each variable which involved the use of judges was then computed. Each score for a given statement was the sum of the five judges' individual ratings. These total scores were to be used in all major analyses of the data.

It was now possible to check the reliability of the ratings and to carry out all of the statistical analyses that were planned. Chapter III contains the results of all of the analyses that were made.

REFERENCES

1. James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *Discussion in Human Affairs* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 191-212.

2. Halbert E. Gulley, *Discussion, Conference, and Group Process* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 81-127, 165-186.

3. Dean C. Barnlund and Franklyn S. Haiman, *The Dynamics of Discussion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960), pp. 244-272.

4. R. Victor Harnack and Thorrel B. Fest, *Group Discussion: Theory and Technique* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), pp. 273-308, 397-446.

5. R. F. Bales, *Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1950).

6. Gerald M. Phillips, *Communication and the Small Group* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966).

7. Allan C. Nichols, "Audience Ratings of the 'Naturalness' of Spoken and Written Sentences," *Speech Monographs*, XXXIII (1966), 155-159.

8. John W. Bowers, "Language Intensity, Social Introversion, and Attitude Change," *Speech Monographs*, XXX(1963), 346-352.

9. This preliminary study was conducted near the end of a school term; consequently, I could schedule only one visit to each class involved. If a student happened to be absent on the day of my scheduled visit, there was no opportunity to have him make his judgments at a later time.

10. Robert L. Ebel, "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," *Psychometrika*, XVI(1951), 407-424.

11. Harry H. Harman, *Modern Factor Analysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

12. Group 8 on the question of hours for undergraduate women was later assigned to discuss the question on undergraduates' possession of automobiles. Several of the groups discussing the latter question proved to be unusable because of absenteeism. To compensate for this loss of discussions, I reassigned Group 8. The positions which this group had chosen on the question of undergraduates' possession of automobiles were A, A, A, C, D, and E. Even though this distribution did not meet the criterion of equal representation of the extremes in policy, the group did seem to represent both liberal and conservative positions.

13. For scoring purposes, I reorganized the alternatives as they appeared on the initial questionnaire.

14. Blommers and Lindquist, p. 350.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Reliability of the Ratings

Before making any of the analyses of variance or the contingency analyses which I had planned, I first checked the reliability of the ratings of the statements on those variables which involved the use of judges. As in the preliminary study, Ebel's procedure for estimating the reliability of ratings was employed.[1] Table 11 contains the reliability coefficients for both the estimated reliability of the individual judge's ratings and the reliability of the combined ratings (or total of five judges' ratings, the value to be used in all subsequent analyses) on each variable.

TABLE 11

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR RATINGS OF SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES

Variable	Reliability of Individual Ratings	Reliability of Combined Ratings
1. Clarity	.342	.722
2. Opinionatedness	.397	.767
3. Interest	.144	.457
4. Amount of Information	.330	.711
5. Provocativeness	.659	.956
6. Orientation	.310	.692
7. Objectivity	.402	.771

These ratings compare favorably with the ratings of the same variables in the preliminary study, as Table 12 shows.

In the preliminary study, amount of information and objectivity were each rated by only four judges. Had they been rated by five judges, the reliability of the average ratings on each would probably

TABLE 12

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE TOTAL RATINGS
OF SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES FROM THE
PRELIMINARY AND FINAL STUDY

Variable	Preliminary Study	Final Study
1. Clarity	.811	.722
2. Opinionatedness	.668	.767
3. Interest	.729	.457
4. Amount of Information	.862	.711
5. Provocativeness	.672	.956
6. Orientation	.690	.692
7. Objectivity	.450	.771

have been somewhat higher. One should consider this point in making comparisons with the reliability coefficients for these two variables in the final study.

The variations between the two sets of reliability coefficients seem to be within the range one would expect by chance. The only substantial loss in reliability appears to have been in the judgments of interest. A check on the individual ratings of this variable revealed that of 3000 separate judgments, only 267 (less than ten percent) were 3 or lower. In other words, for most of their ratings, the judges were using only four points on a seven-point scale. The use of a narrow range of values restricts discrimination and can, therefore, lower reliability. This appears to have been what happened in the ratings of interest. For future research, the variable will, no doubt, have to be defined more precisely so that judges can detect a greater range in levels of interest. For the other six variables, simply expanding the number of judges from five to ten, or more, may be sufficient to increase reliability.

In making comparisons between the two sets of reliability coefficients for any one of the variables, one must remember that the conditions under which the judgments were made in the final study were quite different from the conditions under which they were made in the preliminary study. A different group judged each variable in the preliminary study, but the same group did all of the judging in the final study. The judges in the preliminary study rated only fifty statements on one variable while the judges in the final study rated six hundred statements on seven variables. In addition, the judges in the final study made their ratings at different times and in different places. Had the conditions under which they made their ratings been more uniform, the reliability of their ratings might have been somewhat higher.

Determining the Independence of the Variables

As in the preliminary study, a factor analysis was made to determine how independent the variables were. Table 13 contains the correlation matrix of the variables.

TABLE 13

CORRELATION MATRIX OF RATINGS OF
EIGHT DISCUSSION VARIABLES

	Cl.	Op.	In.	In.	Pr.	Or.	Ob.	Le.
Clarity		-.10	-.11	-.03	.02	.07	.27	-.36
Opinionatedness			.07	-.04	-.64	-.39	-.71	-.04
Interest				.25	-.05	.22	-.28	.45
Information					-.38	.04	-.23	.46
Provocativeness						.45	.63	-.05
Orientation							.44	.19
Objectivity								-.29
Length								

All values exceeding ± .08 are significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 13 shows that the correlations among opinionatedness, objectivity, and provocativeness are rather high. The highest correlation in the table is between opinionatedness and objectivity. If one were to correct for the unreliability on both of these measures, the hypothesis of an almost perfect correlation would be tenable.

When the variables were factor analyzed,[2] the factor structure shown in Table 14 was obtained.

The two factors presented in Table 14 accounted for only 43.7 percent of the total variance in the 4200 scores on which the analysis was based. Factor I accounted for 30.2 percent while Factor II accounted for the remaining 13.5 percent. A substantial proportion of the variance in the judgments of opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity was accounted for by the two factors. All three of these variables had their highest loading on Factor I. This means, of course that they were more like one another than they were any of the other

TABLE 14

FACTOR STRUCTURE OF EIGHT DISCUSSION VARIABLES

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	h^2
1. Clarity	-.10	-.30	.10
2. Opinionatedness	.81	.03	.66
3. Interest	-.01	.55	.31
4. Amount of Information	.09	.57	.33
5. Provocativeness	-.76	-.19	.62
6. Orientation	-.59	.20	.40
7. Objectivity	-.78	-.40	.77
8. Length	-.06	.76	.58

variables. The communality scores (column headed h^2) show that a great deal of the variance in clarity, interest, amount of information, and orientation could not be accounted for by the two factors; that is, it was unexplained variance. More than half of the variance in length could be accounted for in terms of the two factors. Virtually all of this was attributable to Factor II.

Although it is clear from the factor structure that the variables which I examined were not completely independent, they still seemed to be different enough to justify treating each separately. Even for those variables which correlated with others between .60 and .70, there would be a great deal of error in attempting to predict the value of one from a knowledge of the value of another.[3]

The remainder of this chapter presents the results of all of the analyses that I made. The first set of results presented are the analyses of variance that were made to identify which of the variables distinguish the statements of consensus groups from the statements of non-consensus groups. These data are followed by the results of the contingency analyses that were made to determine if consecutive discussion statements are related and how the relationships differ for consensus and non-consensus groups.

Analyses of Variance of Eight Discussion Variables

A separate two-factor analysis of variance was made for each of the variables in the study. The statistical procedures employed were those outlined by Lindquist for a two-factor completely randomized design.[4] The two factors in every case were the type of group (Consensus and Non-Consensus) and the question discussed (Women's Hours, Undergraduates' Possession of Automobiles, and Grading).

Only the values assigned to the first statement in each pair of discussion statements were used in the analyses of variance. In other words, each analysis was based on the values assigned to only three hundred of the six hundred statements. The second statement was to be used only for the contingency analyses. The analysis of variance results on each of the variables appear in the next eight sections of this chapter.

Clarity

The results of the analysis of variance on the ratings of clarity are presented in Table 15. The statements for each group exhibited about the same amount of clarity. The lowest score which any statement could receive was 5, and the highest was 35. The mean values of the statements selected from each group fell between 23 and 25. On the whole, then, the statements of all six groups appear to have been moderately clear.

TABLE 15

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF CLARITY RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	24.440	23.360
2. Cars	23.240	23.200
3. Grades	23.020	23.040

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	10.084	10.084	.321
Question	2	41.848	20.924	.665
Type of Group x Question	2	19.121	9.561	.304
Within Cells	294	9249.864	31.462	
Total	299	9320.918		

None of the F-ratios in this analysis was significant. In other words, the differences among the six groups in the mean clarity scores of the discussion statements were no greater than could be expected by chance. If clarity is a variable related to the outcomes of discussions, it did not show up in this study.

Opinionatedness

The results of the analysis of variance on opinionatedness are presented in Table 16. Examination of the cell means shows that the statements of the groups, as a whole, were moderately opinionated. The means fell between 20 and 25, while there was a possible range of 5 to 35.

TABLE 16

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY
OF OPINIONATEDNESS RATINGS OF
THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	20.460	24.240
2. Cars	20.900	20.260
3. Grades	23.340	21.640

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	17.279	17.279	.338
Question	2	226.686	113.342	2.214
Type of Group x Question	2	422.418	211.209	4.126*
Within Cells	294	15050.403	51.192	
Total	299	15716.787		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The F-ratio for the interaction between the type of group and the question discussed was significant, which indicated that the difference in the mean rating of opinionatedness between a consensus and non-consensus group depended on the question which they discussed. To determine which of the consensus groups differed from its corresponding non-consensus group, I used the _t_-test procedure described by Lindquist.[5] Table 17 contains a summary of the results.

TABLE 17

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON OPINIONATEDNESS

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	$\underline{t}$
1. Hours	-3.780	-2.407*
2. Cars	.640	.407
3. Grades	1.700	1.082

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Only on women's hours was the difference between the consensus and non-consensus group greater than could reasonably be attributed to chance. The statements of the non-consensus group discussing that question were significantly more opinionated than the statements of the consensus group.

Interest

Table 18 contains the results of the analysis of variance on interest. Inspection of the cell means reveals a range between 23 and 27 in a possible range of 5 to 35, indicating a moderate amount of interest in the topics which the groups discussed.

The F-ratio for the interaction between type of group and question was significant; therefore, it was necessary to make comparisons between individual pairs of cell means to determine how the differences between groups varied from question to question. Table 19 contains the results of all of the comparisons that were made.

Two of the mean differences between consensus and non-consensus groups were significant. The statements of the consensus group which discussed women's hours reflected more interest in the topic than the statements of the corresponding non-consensus group. Just the reverse occurred on the question of undergraduates' possession of automobiles, however. No significant difference between the two groups discussing the question on grades was found.

TABLE 18

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF INTEREST RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	25.280	23.940
2. Cars	24.300	26.280
3. Grades	26.160	25.687

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	14.521	14.521	1.436
Question	2	183.289	91.644	9.063*
Type of Group x Question	2	139.936	69.968	6.919*
Within Cells	294	2972.924	10.112	
Total	299	3310.670		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE 19

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON INTEREST

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	t
1. Hours	1.340	2.106*
2. Cars	-1.980	-3.133*
3. Grades	.680	1.069

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Amount of Information

Table 20 summarizes the results of the analysis of variance on the ratings of amount of information. Examination of the cell means reveals that the statements of all six groups tended to contain little information (in the sense of facts, statistics, and opinions of qualified sources). This, of course, is understandable because the participating students were not given their topics until immediately before the discussions.

TABLE 20

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF AMOUNT OF INFORMATION RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	9.960	7.600
2. Cars	11.420	12.580
3. Grades	7.960	7.500

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	22.963	22.963	1.791
Question	2	990.126	495.063	38.620*
Type of Group x Question	2	155.207	77.603	6.054*
Within Cells	294	3768.700	12.819	
Total	299	4936.997		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Despite the small amount of information characterizing all of the groups, the F-ratio for interaction was significant; that is, the difference in the amount of information between a consensus and non-consensus group was not uniform across questions. The presence of significant interaction necessitated further examination of the differences between the consensus and non-consensus groups which discussed each question. The results are presented in Table 21.

The difference between the consensus and non-consensus group which discussed women's hours was significant. The consensus group's

TABLE 21

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS
ON AMOUNT OF INFORMATION

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	t
1. Hours	2.360	3.291*
2. Cars	-1.160	-1.617
3. Grades	.460	.641

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

statements contained more information than the non-consensus group's. The consensus groups which discussed the other two questions did not differ significantly from the corresponding non-consensus groups.

Provocativeness

Table 22 is a summary of the analysis of variance results on provocativeness. The table shows that the cell means had an actual range between 17 and 22 in a possible range of 5 to 35. Considered collectively, they tended to fall below the midpoint of the possible range of values. One could interpret this tendency as meaning that the statements, as a whole, were only slightly provocative.

TABLE 22

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF
PROVOCATIVENESS RATINGS OF THREE
HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	21.560	18.320
2. Cars	19.400	17.960
3. Grades	18.040	20.300

TABLE 22 (CONT'D)

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	48.804	48.804	.780
Question	2	80.687	40.343	.644
Type of Group x Question	2	393.164	196.582	3.138*
Within Cells	294	18417.542	62.645	
Total	299	18940.197		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The F-ratio for interaction was significant, again indicating that the differences between consensus groups and non-consensus groups were not consistent across questions. Table 23 contains the results of the follow-up comparisons between individual pairs of cell means.

TABLE 23

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON PROVOCATIVENESS

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	$\underline{t}$
1. Hours	3.240	2.051*
2. Cars	1.440	.917
3. Grades	-2.260	-1.439

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The only significant difference between a consensus and a non-consensus group was for the pair discussing women's hours. The statements of the consensus group were significantly more provocative than those of the non-consensus group; that is, they tended to invite or welcome responses to a greater extent than the statements of the non-consensus group.

Orientation

Table 24 contains the results of the analysis of variance on orientation. The cell means in the table indicate that the statements of all six groups, on the average, clustered slightly below the midpoint of the range of possible values (this range being from 5 to 35). In other words, the average statement from the discussions was likely to give only a moderate amount of orientation.

TABLE 24

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF ORIENTATION RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	20.580	16.800
2. Cars	18.360	18.100
3. Grades	19.360	17.120

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	328.653	328.653	15.910*
Question	2	13.807	6.903	.334
Type of Group x Question	2	155.685	77.842	3.768*
Within Cells	294	6073.002	20.656	
Total	299	6571.147		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Once again, the F-ratio for interaction was significant; that is, differences between consensus groups and non-consensus groups varied from question to question. The differences were more nearly consistent, however, on this variable than those found for any of the other variables. The follow-up t-tests are reported in Table 25.

On both women's hours and grades, the statements of the consensus groups were rated significantly higher on orientation than the statements of the non-consensus groups which discussed the same questions. The statements of the two groups discussing undergraduates' possession

TABLE 25

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON ORIENTATION

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	t
1. Hours	3.780	3.946*
2. Cars	.260	.271
3. Grades	2.240	2.340*

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

of automobiles were not significantly different, although the direction of the difference was consistent with those found for the other two questions.

Objectivity

Table 26 contains the information relevant to the analysis of variance of the ratings of objectivity. The statements of the six discussion groups, on the whole, were somewhat below the midpoint of the objectivity scale. The cell means fell between 13 and 20 in a possible range of 5 to 35.

TABLE 26

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVITY RATINGS OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	19.200	13.700
2. Cars	16.940	16.400
3. Grades	15.820	14.920

TABLE 26 (CONT'D)

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	401.364	401.364	10.995*
Question	2	96.827	48.413	1.326
Type of Group x Question	2	382.423	191.212	5.238*
Within Cells	294	10732.382	36.505	
Total	299	11612.998		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The F-ratio for the interaction of the type of group and the question discussed was significant. This indicated, of course, that the magnitude of the difference between a consensus and a non-consensus group depended on the question being discussed. The results of the follow-up tests made for each pair of consensus and non-consensus groups are presented in Table 27.

TABLE 27

TESTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL PAIRS OF CELL MEANS ON OBJECTIVITY

Question	$\bar{X}_C - \bar{X}_{NC}$	t
1. Hours	5.500	4.545*
2. Cars	.540	.446
3. Grades	.900	.743

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The statements of the consensus group which discussed women's hours were judged to be significantly more objective than the statements of the non-consensus group which discussed the same question. The differences between the consensus and non-consensus groups which discussed the other questions were no greater than could be expected by chance though, again, the obtained differences favored the consensus groups.

Length

The final variable analyzed was length. The results of the analysis may be found in Table 28. The means for the six groups fell in a range between 22 and 34. On the average, then, the statements tended to be reasonably short.

TABLE 28

CELL MEANS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY OF THE LENGTH OF THREE HUNDRED STATEMENTS

Question	Consensus Group $\bar{X}$	Non-Consensus Group $\bar{X}$
1. Hours	24.500	23.360
2. Cars	33.360	29.160
3. Grades	22.900	23.580

Summary Table

Source	df	ss	ms	F
Type of Group	1	180.962	180.962	.348
Question	2	3950.846	1975.423	3.804*
Type of Group x Question	2	304.082	152.041	.293
Within Cells	294	152692.941	519.364	
Total	299	157128.838		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The only F-ratio in the analysis of the variance of the length of the statements which was significant was for the questions which the groups discussed. In other words, the length of the statements varied significantly among questions but not between consensus and non-consensus groups. There was, therefore, no reason for making follow-up tests.

Contingency Analyses

Analyses of Relationships Between the Value of One Statement and the Value of the Following Statement on the Same Variable

After the analyses of variance of the eight discussion variables were completed, contingency analyses were made to determine what kinds of relationships existed between consecutive discussion statements and how these relationships differed for consensus and non-consensus groups. The value assigned to the three hundred statements which had been used in the analyses of variance were correlated with the values assigned to the three hundred statements which immediately followed them. A separate analysis was made for each group on each variable. Table 29 contains the results of these correlational analyses. Each correlation coefficient in the table represents the relationship between the first and second members of fifty pairs of statements from one of the six discussions on one of the eight variables.

TABLE 29

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF DISCUSSION STATEMENTS ON EIGHT VARIABLES

Variable	Question and Type of Group					
	Hours		Cars		Grades	
	C	NC	C	NC	C	NC
Clarity	-.15	.26	.28*	.14	.03	.09
Opinionatedness	-.10	.07	.00	.05	-.19	.02
Interest	.20	.01	.10	.25	.09	.00
Information	.06	.08	-.13	.13	-.09	-.09
Provocativeness	-.21	-.22	-.13	-.16	-.02	-.10
Orientation	-.06	.44*	.22	.05	-.07	.42*
Objectivity	-.13	.05	.09	.08	-.01	.13
Length	.04	.14	-.16	.22	-.03	.10

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Only three of the correlations in Table 29 were significant. One could expect three out of forty-eight correlations to be significant by chance since the .05 level of confidence was used. Even when the groups were collapsed across questions and the correlations between statements re-calculated on the basis of one hundred-fifty pairs of statements, a very small number proved significant.

Table 30 contains the correlation coefficients for the pairs of discussion statements on each variable when the question discussed was disregarded. Again only three were significant. What is of some interest, however, is that all three are associated with the non-consensus groups. Of course, increasing the number of cases on which a correlation is based reduces the value of r necessary for significance; therefore, that three of the eight correlations for the non-consensus groups were significant may not be too meaningful. In fact, all three of the significant correlations were low.

TABLE 30

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF
DISCUSSION STATEMENTS FROM CONSENSUS AND
NON-CONSENSUS GROUPS COMBINED

Variable	Type of Group	
	C	NC
Clarity	.07	.15
Opinionatedness	-.13	.12
Interest	.14	.23*
Information	.00	.34*
Provocativeness	-.13	-.15
Orientation	.02	.25
Objectivity	-.03	.15
Length	-.06	.15

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Analyses of Relationships Between the Value of One Statement on a Given Variable and the Value of the Following Statement on Different Variables

Despite the general lack of relationship between the pairs of discussion statements when the value of each member on the same variable was considered, it was possible that different kinds of relationships existed. Highly opinionated statements, for example, might be followed by unclear statements or by statements low in information. To determine if such relationships did, in fact, exist, additional correlations were computed for every possible combination of variables for each of the six groups. Tables 31 through 33 contain the results. Each table presents the findings for the consensus and non-consensus groups which discussed the same question, and it contains only those values that were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 31 contains the results for the groups which discussed women's hours. Only three of the correlations for the consensus group were significant, and none of these indicated the existence of strong relationships between consecutive statements. The clarity and opinionatedness of the first statement in each pair correlated positively with the provocativeness of the second while orientation correlated negatively with provocativeness.

TABLE 31

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF
STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS
ON WOMEN'S HOURS

First Statement	Second Statement							
	Cl.	Op.	In.	In.	Pr.	Or.	Ob.	Le.
Consensus								
Clarity					.28			
Opinionatedness					.35			
Interest								
Information								
Provocativeness								
Orientation								
Objectivity					-.29			
Length								
Non-Consensus								
Clarity								
Opinionatedness				-.30	.28			-.28
Interest						.33		
Information		-.38	-.34				.30	
Provocativeness				.40				.28
Orientation		-.33				.44	.28	.39
Objectivity			.37	.38		.39		.39
Length								

In contrast to the limited number of significant correlations associated with the consensus group, a much larger number was found for the non-consensus group. The opinionatedness of the first statement was related to the amount of information, provocativeness, and length of the second. Interest correlated with orientation. Significant correlations were also found between the amount of information in the first statement and the degree of opinionatedness, interest, and objectivity of the second. Provocativeness correlated with both amount of information and length while orientation correlated with opinionatedness, orientation, objectivity, and length. Significant relationships were also detected between the objectivity of the first statement in each pair and the interest, amount of information, orientation, and length of the second. The total number of significant relationships from the non-consensus group was seventeen. Despite this rather substantial number of significant relationships, none was very strong.

The results of the correlational analyses for the groups which discussed undergraduates' possession of automobiles are presented in Table 32. For the consensus group, only two of the correlations were significant. The provocativeness of the first statement in each pair was related to the opinionatedness of the second, and length was related to orientation.

TABLE 32

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS ON STUDENTS' POSSESSION OF CARS

First Statement	Second Statement							
	Cl.	Op.	In.	In.	Pr.	Or.	Ob.	Le.
Consensus								
Clarity								
Opinionatedness								
Interest								
Information								
Provocativeness		.30						
Orientation								
Objectivity						-.29		
Length								

TABLE 32 (CONT'D)

	Cl.	Op.	In.	In.	Pr.	Or.	Ob.	Le.
Non-Consensus								
Clarity		-.32						-.29
Opinionatedness	-.38		.31			.36		.28
Interest	.29						-.31	
Information								.30
Provocativeness								
Orientation		.28						
Objectivity			-.30					
Length								

As for women's hours, a number of significant relationships between consecutive statements of the non-consensus group were found. The clarity of the first statement in each pair was related to the clarity, interest, orientation, and length of the second. The amount of interest reflected in the first statement also was related to the opinionatedness and objectivity of the second. The amount of information in the first statement was related to the length of the second, and orientation was similarly related to opinionatedness. Finally,the objectivity of the first statement was significantly related to the amount of interest reflected in the second. Once again, none of the correlations indicated strong relationships between the statements.

Table 33 summarizes the data relevant to the relationships between the statements which were selected from the groups discussing the University's policy on grading. For the consensus group, none of the correlations was significant; for the non-consensus group, eleven were. The amount of interest reflected in the first statement of each pair was related to both the opinionatedness and the provocativeness of the second statement. The amount of information in the first statement was related to orientation as reflected in the second while the provocativeness of the first statement correlated with both interest and orientation as reflected in the second. Orientation on the first statement of each pair was significantly related to opinionatedness, orientation, and objectivity on the second. As for the other two questions, none of the correlations was very high.

One final set of analyses was made. Using only the first statement in each pair, I divided the sample on the basis of the sex of the individuals making the statements. I then made a series of t-tests to determine if the statements of males differed from those of females on any of the variables. Since these analyses were additional and not directly relevant to the two major questions of the study, I have included the results in Appendix I rather than in the body of this report.

TABLE 33

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF PAIRS OF STATEMENTS FROM TWO DISCUSSIONS ON GRADING

First Statement	Second Statement							
	Cl.	Op.	In.	In.	Pr.	Or.	Ob.	Le.
Consensus								
Clarity								
Opinionatedness								
Interest								
Information								
Provocativeness								
Orientation								
Objectivity								
Length								
Non-Consensus								
Clarity								
Opinionatedness								
Interest		-.35			.38			
Information						.39		
Provocativeness			.37			-.40		
Orientation		-.28				.42	.50	
Objectivity								
Length		-.40				.56	.46	

In this chapter I have simply attempted to present the results of the study as completely and concisely as possible. In the next chapter, I will discuss the results in relation to the major questions which this study sought to answer.

REFERENCES

1. Robert L. Ebel, "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," Psychometrika, XVI(1951), 407-424.

2. The methods employed in carrying out the factor analysis were those suggested in Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

3. Paul Blommers and E. F. Lindquist, *Elementary Statistical Methods in Psychology and Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960), p. 433.

4. E. F. Lindquist, *Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953), pp. 207-216.

5. Lindquist, p. 98.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This investigation was designed to answer two major questions about group communication:

> 1. Are the statements (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) of discussion groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus distinguishable from the statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?
>
> 2. Are the relationships (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) between consecutive statements of discussion groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus different from the relationships between consecutive statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?

The answers to these questions should be clear from the presentation of the results in the preceding chapter. In this chapter, I will consider possible explanations for the results and offer suggestions for further research whenever such research seems to be warranted.

Discussion of Results on Question 1

Only on two of the eight variables examined in this study was it impossible to distinguish the statements of at least one consensus group from the statements of the corresponding non-consensus group. These non-discriminating variables were clarity and length. On each of the remaining six variables, significant interaction appeared between the question discussed and the type of group. For four of these--opinionatedness, provocativeness, objectivity, and amount of information--the results were quite similar. Significant differences between the statements of the consensus and non-consensus groups were found on the question of women's hours, but not on the other two questions. On interest and orientation, significant differences between the statements of consensus and non-consensus groups were found for two of the three questions. In the next three sections, I will discuss the variables in terms of the patterns of results that were obtained.

Variables Which Failed to Distinguish the Statements of Consensus Groups from the Statements of Non-Consensus Groups

Clarity

Clarity was one of the two variables on which it was not possible to distinguish the statements of consensus groups from the statements of non-consensus groups. Perhaps clarity simply has no relationship to the consensual outcome of a discussion. If this were true, however, then, all other things being equal, a group whose statements are very unclear would be just as likely to reach consensus as a group whose statements are very clear. For some, this possibility may be hard to accept; nevertheless, at present, it cannot be excluded from the list of possible explanations.

A more plausible explanation is that clarity is important to the outcome of a discussion only up to a certain point, and beyond this point, other things must happen if a group is to reach consensus. In other words, minimal clarity may be a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for reaching consensus. If this explanation has any validity, then the failure of clarity to distinguish the consensus groups from the non-consensus groups in this study is understandable. The statements of each of the six groups were judged to be moderately clear. They may simply have surpassed the point at which clarity is a critical variable. The non-consensus groups, then, would have failed to achieve consensus for reasons other than a lack of clarity.

One could determine which of the preceding explanations is the more satisfactory by comparing groups whose statements have low average clarity with groups whose statements have high average clarity. If the first possibility is the more accurate explanation, then one would find approximately the same proportion of both types of groups reaching consensus. If the second possibility is a more accurate explanation, a significantly higher proportion of the groups whose statements have high average clarity would reach consensus than the groups whose statements have low average clarity.

One further possibility needs to be explored. In preparing the judging materials, I provided a context for many of the statements which, in isolation, could refer to a variety of situations, but which did not in the actual discussions. In so doing, I may have unintentionally affected the judges' ratings in such a manner that if clarity were related to the outcomes of the discussions, its relationship could not be detected. Were this true, one would expect the judges not to have assigned low ratings to very many statements. A re-examination of the individual ratings of clarity revealed that none of the judges used the values 1, 2, or 3 very frequently. Of the 3000 separate ratings of clarity, 175 were 1, 320 were 2, and 285 were 3. This relatively infrequent use of scale values could either have been the result of my having increased the clarity of the statements by adding descriptive phrases or the result of freshmen rhetoric students' being very homogeneous on this criterion. In either case, differences between groups would be difficult to detect.

In future research, a more advisable procedure may be to have judges rate all of the statements in a discussion before a sample is selected. With this procedure, the need to provide judges with contextual cues would be eliminated. One would then be in a better position to determine if the type of participants used in this investigation are actually as homogeneous on the criterion of clarity as they appear to be.

The only conclusion which the results of this investigation seem to warrant is that clarity does not ordinarily appear to be related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy.

Length

Length, like clarity, was not found to be related to the outcomes of the discussions in this study, but unlike clarity, it was related to the question discussed. Perhaps length is irrelevant to the outcome of a discussion. On the other hand, it may only be irrelevant within a certain range. In discussions where the average statement is extremely long or extremely short, length may be related to the outcomes. One might expect, for example, that relatively few groups whose members have little to say on the subjects they are discussing would reach consensus, or he might expect that relatively few groups whose members make extremely long statements would reach consensus.

One could determine which of the two explanations above is more plausible by comparing groups whose statements, on the average, are very short with groups whose statements are moderately long and very long. If length is irrelevant to the outcome of a discussion, then the proportion of each type of group reaching consensus should be about the same. If length is irrelevant only within a certain range, then the proportion of each type of group reaching consensus should not be uniform.

On the basis of the results of this study, I can only tentatively conclude that length, within reasonable limits, does not appear to be related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy.

Variables Which Distinguished the Statements of One Consensus Group from the Statements of the Corresponding Non-Consensus Group

Opinionatedness, Provocativeness, and Objectivity

As I pointed out in Chapter III, opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity were more strongly related to one another than they were to any of the other variables. The correlations of opinionatedness with provocativeness and objectivity were -.64 and -.71 respectively. The correlation of provocativeness with objectivity was .63. All three of these variables had their highest loadings on the same factor in the factor analysis of the eight variables. In addition, the patterns of results in the analyses of variance of these three variables were similar. For these reasons, I will discuss the results on opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity simultaneously rather than separately. The same explanations appear to be applicable to all three.

Only on women's hours was it possible to distinguish the statements of the consensus group from the statements of the corresponding non-consensus group on opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity. There are at least two possible explanations for this lack of consistency in results. I will explore each of them in detail.

All three questions used in this study were classified as questions of policy, yet the one on women's hours may have been different from the others in one very important respect. One of the major issues, if not the major issue, which arose in both of the discussions on this question involved moral responsibility. This issue concerned whether underaged women can be trusted to behave responsibly if they have no restrictions placed on their night time whereabouts. In the discussions on the other two questions, issues of this kind did not arise. On undergraduates' possession of automobiles, the major issue was the practicality of allowing an increased number of students to have automobiles. Much of the discussions on the University's policy on grading centered on the comparative sensitivity of an A through F system and a Pass-Fail system in discriminating among various levels of achievement. The variations in the kinds of issues which arose in the six discussions suggest that the groups on women's hours found themselves confronted with a different kind of conflict to resolve than the other four groups.

Using Guetzkow and Gyr's classification of species of conflict, one might argue that women's hours is the kind of question which gives rise to "Affective Conflict"[1] while the others are the kinds which give rise to "Substantive Conflict."[2] Opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity may be related to the outcomes of discussion when groups are in affective conflict but not when they are in substantive conflict.

Making relatively unopinionated, objective, and provocative statements may help to ease tension in a discussion on a question like women's hours, thereby facilitating achievement of the group's goal. On the other hand, relatively more opinionated, less objective, and less provocative statements may serve to accentuate differences and to generate tension among the members of a group, thereby impeding progress toward the achievement of the group's goal.

Research by both Bowers[3] and Thompson[4] may bear indirectly on the point I am making. These investigators found that intense language in persuasive messages can have a boomerang effect; that is, as a result of hearing a speech which employs very intense language (extreme departure from neutrality), a listener's attitude toward a proposition may become even less favorable than it was before he heard the speech. Although Bowers and Thompson were investigating a different kind of problem than I was, perhaps in discussions on questions like women's hours the same principle applies. Individual discussants may react negatively to others who vigorously attempt to persuade them to change their positions. Thus, a group whose members make relatively unopinionated statements, who welcome or invite the comments of others, and who consciously avoid attempting to persuade others to accept their points of view may increase its chances for achieving consensus. On other kinds of questions, however, opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity may be irrelevant, in which case one would not expect to find differences between the statements of consensus and non-consensus groups on these attributes.

A second possible explanation (which is not completely unrelated to the first) for the results on the three variables in question involves both the type of question and the composition of the discussion groups. The consensus group on women's hours had five male participants and only one female participant, but the non-consensus group had three participants of each sex. All of the groups had been told in advance of their discussions that the results could have implications for future policy. Since women would be more directly affected than men by any change in the University's policy on women's hours, it is understandable that the statements of a group having three women might be more opinionated, less provocative, and less objective than the statements of a group having only one woman.

Because the men would not be as directly affected by the policy on women's hours, they may have been able to pursue the question with a greater spirit of inquiry. In fact, the very first statement in the consensus group's discussion was, "The person best qualified to answer the first question is Sue Morton." The gentleman was referring to the first question on the discussion agenda which was, "What, if any, disadvantages are there to the present policy?" The statement which I have quoted seems to indicate an open-minded approach to the question. This kind of statement was more characteristic of the consensus group than the non-consensus group.

Gulley has argued that one's objectivity and open-mindedness are inversely related to his involvement in a problem he is discussing.[5] That Gulley makes this point is not necessarily indicative of its validity. Some of the recent research on ego-involvement, however, provides some support for Gulley's assertion and the explanation which I have developed. Separate studies by Whittaker,[6] LaFave and Sherif,[7] and Reich and Sherif[8] have each revealed that people who are highly ego-involved on certain issues have narrower "latitudes of acceptance" than people who are not involved. A latitude of acceptance is all of the positions on an issue which an individual is willing to accept.[9]

Even though three of the members of the consensus group discussing women's hours initially chose the most conservative position and three the most liberal position, they may have had wider latitudes of acceptance than the members of the non-consensus group. In other words, even though the members of the consensus group initially chose the extreme positions as the ones they preferred, they may have found some of the others acceptable while the members of the non-consensus group did not (or at least, more of the members of the non-consensus group did not). If this were true, then it seems reasonable that the statements of the consensus group would be less opinionated, more provocative, and more objective than the statements of the non-consensus group. Having more positions that they could accept, the members of the consensus group could devote more of their energy to considering the merits of the alternatives than to defending the positions which they had chosen initially. If the members of the groups discussing the other questions were equally involved and had similar latitudes of acceptance, differences between the consensus and non-consensus groups on these variables would not be likely to show up.

Although the preceding analysis implies that opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity are indirectly related to the outcome of a discussion via the composition of a group and the relevance of a question to its members, there remains a further implication of the analysis which warrants consideration. The outcome of a discussion may be completely independent of the opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity of statements. These variables may be a function of ego-involvement and yet have nothing to do with reaching consensus. It is possible that any group whose members are highly involved in the question they are discussing will make more opinionated, less provocative, and less objective statements than a group whose members are not involved, but it does not necessarily follow that the first type of group will be less likely to reach consensus than the second.

Which of the above explanations for the results on opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity is more satisfactory, I cannot say at present. I had no independent measures of either the type of conflict or ego-involvement; consequently, without further research, no definite conclusions can be drawn. Such research should vary discussion questions both in terms of the type of conflict to which they give rise and their relevance to the discussants.

Until research of the type which I have suggested is undertaken, I can only tentatively conclude that opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity are not consistently related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy, but, when they are, the statements of consensus groups will be less opinionated, more provocative, and more objective than the statements of non-consensus groups.

Amount of Information

Although it was not highly correlated with any of them, the pattern of results for amount of information was similar to the pattern for the three variables which I have just discussed. The statements of the consensus group on women's hours contained significantly more information than the statements of the non-consensus group. On the other two questions, however, no significant differences were found.

For some, the results for women's hours may be difficult to understand. The non-consensus group had three female participants, yet the statements of this group contained significantly less information than the statements of the consensus group, which had only one female participant. One might expect that because it had more women, and because women presumably would have more information on this particular question than men, the statements of the non-consensus group should have contained more information than the statements of the consensus group. The relevant consideration, however, is not how much information the members of a group have but how much they use.

Because of the similarity in the pattern of results on amount of information with the results on opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity, one of the explanations for the results on these variables may again be applicable. Perhaps amount of information is related to the outcomes of discussions only on certain kinds of questions--namely, those giving rise to affective conflict. Since I have previously developed the background for this explanation in some detail, to do so again at this point would be unnecessarily repetitious. Let me simply point out that it appears to be a defensible position that if groups discussing a question like women's hours are in affective conflict, the one which reaches consensus would be likely to use more information than the one which does not.

An individual may feel uncomfortable in changing his position on a question involving an affective issue such as women's moral behavior without some judtification. Facts, statistics, and the opinions of qualified sources may help to provide the needed justification. On questions having other kinds of issues with less emotional overtones, however, one may not experience any psychological discomfort in changing his position. In such instances, groups may be able to reach consensus without using any more information than groups which are unable to reach consensus.

The possibility which I have just developed needs to be tested. To do so would require a collection of statements from consensus and non-consensus groups, some of which have discussed questions with major issues similar to those which arose in the discussions on women's hours and some of which have discussed questions with major issues similar to those which arose in the discussions on undergraduates' possession of automobiles and grading. One could then determine if consensus groups use more information than non-consensus groups on one kind of question, but not on another.

A second possible explanation for the results involves my definition of information as "facts, statistics, and opinions of qualified sources." Since the groups did not have an opportunity to prepare in advance of their discussions, the only facts, statistics, and opinions of qualified sources which they had at their disposal were those which individual participants happened to remember. Had consensus groups been consistently distinguishable from non-consensus groups in terms of the amount of information which they used, the matter of preparation would be irrelevant. One would expect that if the two types of groups were distinguishable when only relatively small amount of information were available, they would also be distinguishable if they had access to larger amounts of information. Because the differences between the two types of groups were not consistent, however, this matter needs to be explored.

I asked the participating groups to engage in impromptu discussions because, at the time, it was the only efficient way I had to control an individual's amount of preparation. In so doing, however, I may have prevented the relationship between the use of information and the outcomes of discussions from being revealed. Perhaps the consensus groups would have been consistently distinguishable from the non-consensus groups had all of the discussants had some opportunity to acquire more information on their questions.

There are at least two ways in which this problem might be dealt with in future research. The first involves broadening the definition of information to include personal or first-hand experiences, since in an impromptu discussion this is the kind of information on which participants may typically have to rely. Amount of information, more broadly defined, might be more systematically related to the outcomes of discussions than it appeared to be in this study.

Another way to deal with the problem is to prepare materials on the questions to be discussed and to allow participants to read these materials, say, in the half hour immediately preceding their discussions. Such materials would have to be carefully prepared to avoid creating bias toward any particular position on the question, but this should not be too difficult.

Using either of the approaches mentioned above, one might find different results on the relationship between amount of information and the outcomes of discussions than were found in this study. Until systematic investigations are undertaken, however, it is probably pointless to engage in extensive speculation about the relationship. On the basis of the results of this study, I tentatively conclude that amount of information is not consistently related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy, but, when it is, the statements of consensus groups will contain more information than the statements of non-consensus groups.

Variables Which Distinguished the Statements of Two Consensus Groups from the Statements of the Corresponding Non-Consensus Groups

Interest

Interest was one of the two variables on which it was possible to distinguish the statements of more than one consensus group from the statements of corresponding non-consensus groups. What complicates the explanation of the results are the simple effects which were found in the analysis of this variable. On women's hours, the statements of the consensus group exhibited significantly more interest in the subject on the part of the participants than the statements of the non-consensus group. On undergraduates' possession of automobiles, just the opposite result was found. On the question of grading, there was no significant difference between the consensus and non-consensus group in the level of interest which their statements reflected.

On the basis of the results, interest appears to be a variable which is only sometimes related to the outcomes of discussions.. Whether a consensus group's statements reflect a higher level of interest than a non-consensus group's seems to depend on the question being discussed. This possibility may be vitiated, however, when other pertinent information is examined. The observed differences in the level of interest among the six groups may have been a function of their sex distributions. Oddly enough, the two groups whose statements exhibited a higher level of interest than the statements of their counterparts both had five males and only one female. The possibility of interaction between level of interest and the sex distribution could account for the reversal in simple effects. During their discussions, the men may simply have developed more interest in the questions than the women; consequently, their greater interest would tend to show up in those discussions in which they were in the majority. Or presence of three women may have inhibited expressions of interest by males.

The preceding explanation may appear to be a partial contradiction of one of the explanations which I developed in discussing the results on opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity. I noted that the non-consensus group on women's hours was probably more ego-involved than the consensus group because of the differences in their sex distributions. Now I am arguing that the men may have developed more interest than women and that this interest would be more evident in those discussions in which men were in the majority. These two positions need not be contradictory. That one individual is less ego-involved in a problem than another does not preclude the possibility that the less involved individual can manifest greater interest than the more involved individual.

Whether the explanation which I have offered for the results on interest is valid cannot be ascertained from the data collected in this study. One would have to repeat the investigation and be able to compare the results of discussions in which the sex distribution is even with the discussions of groups in which the sex distribution is uneven before drawing any definite conclusions along these lines. As a result of such research, one might find that interest has no relationship to the outcomes of discussions; that is, just as many groups with low interest may reach consensus as groups with high interest.

There is yet another possible explanation which needs to be explored. Interest may bear a greater relationship to the pattern of movement toward consensus than to the achievement of consensus. The members of the consensus group which discussed women's hours each shifted two positions. They agreed to Alternative C which was midway between the most conservative and the most liberal of the explicitly stated policies. This group's statements reflected significantly more interest in the topic than the statements of the corresponding non-consensus group. The members of the consensus group which discussed the University's policy on undergraduates' possession of automobiles agreed on Alternative A after their discussion. This was the most conservative of the explicitly stated policies. Only three members of this group changed their original positions on this question. They each moved four positions. The members of the consensus group which discussed the University's policy on grading agreed to Alternative B which was the second most conservative of the explicitly stated policies. Three members of this group each moved one position, and the others each moved three positions. Although this group's statements did not reflect significantly more interest in the question than the non-consensus group's statements, the mean difference was in the same direction as the difference between the groups which discussed women's hours. There may be some relationship between the extent to which each member in a group changes his position and the level of interest in the group. When everyone changed his position, the level of interest in the consensus group was equal to or greater than the level of interest in the non-consensus groups. When only three participants changed their positions, the level of interest in the consensus group was lower than the level of interest in the corresponding non-consensus group. Had the pattern of movement been more similar for the consensus groups, perhaps more consistent differences between consensus and non-consensus groups would have been found.

Even if the possibility which I have just developed is an accurate explanation for the results, there is no way of determining from the data what the nature of the relationship between pattern of movement toward consensus and interest may be. Does the level of interest which the discussants exhibit affect the pattern of movement toward consensus, or vice versa? Perhaps the relationship is a reciprocal one, or perhaps both the level of interest and pattern of movement are related to some third, unidentified variable. To worry about the nature of this relationship is premature. What is important for the immediate future is to determine if the possibility of a relationship between the pattern of movement toward consensus and the level of interest reflected in the statements of groups which achieve consensus is tenable. The data from this study suggest the existence of such a relationship, but they do not establish it.

I have previously hinted at the type of study which might be done to determine if the pattern of movement toward consensus and interest are related. One could, for example, compare the level of interest reflected in the statements of consensus groups whose patterns of movement are similar with the interest reflected in the statements of non-consensus groups to discover if the two types are consistently different. Three conditions might be used. In one all of the members of the consensus groups would have moved an equal distance; in another all of the members of the consensus groups would have moved, but not equally; and in the third, only half of the members of the consensus groups would have moved.

In addition to studying the pattern of movement of groups, it may also be advisable to investigate the relationship between interest and individual change. One could compare the levels of interest reflected in the statements of individuals who change their positions in the direction of consensus with the interest reflected in the statements of those who do not change. This type of investigation may help to show more clearly what the relationship between interest and the outcome of a discussion is.

Two possible explanations for the results on interest have been explored. Perhaps either one or both are valid. Perhaps both are invalid. Until such research as has been suggested is done, the only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn is that in discussions on questions of policy, the statements of consensus groups are sometimes distinguishable from the statements of non-consensus groups in the level of interest they reflect, but the direction of the differences is not consistent.

Orientation

Orientation was more consistently related to the outcomes of the discussions in this study than any of the other seven variables. The statements of the consensus groups which discussed both women's hours and grading were rated significantly higher on this attribute than the statements of the corresponding non-consensus groups. Although the consensus and non-consensus groups were not significantly different on undergraduates' possession of automobiles, the mean difference on orientation favored the consensus group.

Perhaps these results come as no surprise. All six groups were initially in conflict, and those which reached consensus somehow had to resolve their differences. That the statements of the consensus groups should reflect greater attempts to reach the goal of selecting one best policy than the statements of the non-consensus group, therefore, is understandable.

The reason for the relationship between orientation and consensus which I found may be best explained in terms of Deutsch's notion of "promotive interdependence."[10] If the members of a group are promotively interdependent, no one member can attain his goal unless the other members do also. The goal of selecting the one best solution to a problem, it seems to me, makes a group promotively interdependent. It is reasonable, therefore, that groups whose members make statements which are designed to reduce conflict and provide direction for the discussion would be more likely to achieve consensus than groups whose members do not make these kinds of statements (or, at least, relatively fewer of these kinds of statements).

Up to this point, because of the inconsistency in relationships of the other variables to the outcomes of discussions, the kinds of investigations which I have been forced to suggest for future research essentially involve attempts to account for the inconsistency. Although the results on the relationship between orientation and the outcomes of discussions were not perfectly consistent, they seem to be general enough to warrant a different kind of additional research. Perhaps in further studies of this variable, it would be profitable to concentrate on training discussants to inject into discussions the kinds of statements that are rated high on orientation to determine experimentally if they can favorably affect the outcomes.

On the basis of the results of this study, I conclude that orientation is generally related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy. The statements of consensus groups will be higher in orientation than the statements of non-consensus groups. The evidence supporting this conclusion is stronger than for any other variable in the investigation.

Discussion of Results on Question 2

Relationships Between Consecutive Statements on the Same Variable

This study was designed to discover if the value of one statement on a given variable is contingent upon the value of the one that precedes it. The rationale for this phase of the investigation was that if relationships of this kind were uncovered, then we would have learned something of value about the process of group communication. One would be able to tell, for example, if and how the process in discussions which terminate in consensus differs from the process in discussions which terminate in non-consensus. In addition, we would have acquired a useful tool for further study of communication processes.

Unfortunately, the eight contingency analyses that were made, in general, failed to yield significant relationships between consecutive discussion statements. Highly objective statements, for example, were no more likely to be followed by other highly objective statements than they were by moderately or even slightly objective statements. The results permit no generalizations about the process of group communication. They fail to establish a reliable index of the predictability of the value of a statement on a particular variable when the value of the preceding statement on the same variable is known. The only generalization that the results do permit is that, regardless of the outcome of a discussion, there appears to be no strong relationship between the value of one statement and the value of the following statement on the same variable. This generalization holds for clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length.

Relationships Between Consecutive Statements on Different Variables

When consecutive statements were correlated in terms of all possible combinations of the eight variables, several significant relationships were found. (See Tables 30, 31, and 32 in Chapter III). Most of these, however, were weak. Of even greater interest than the discovery of particular significant relationships was the fact that, of the forty-four significant correlations, thirty-nine were associated with non-consensus groups. Apparently, the statements of non-consensus groups are not as independent of each other as the statements of consensus groups.

Despite the substantial number of significant correlations found for the discussions of the non-consensus groups, there was not enough consistency to permit meaningful generalizations. Consider opinionatedness, for example. For the groups which discussed women's hours, the opinionatedness of the first statement in each pair correlated significantly with the amount of information, provocativeness, and length of the second statement. For the group which discussed undergraduates' possession of automobiles, however, the opinionatedness of the first statement in each pair correlated significantly with the clarity, interest, orientation, and length of the second. Length was the only variable which appeared in both lists, but on the first question it was negatively related to opinionatedness, and on the second it was positively related to opinionatedness. For the group which discussed grading, the opinionatedness of the first statement was not significantly related to the second statement in each pair on any of the variables. Tables 30, 31, and 32 in Chapter III show that this kind of inconsistency was widespread.

The results of this study do not seem to warrant any further investigation of the relationships between consecutive statements on most of the characteristics which I measured. The orientation variable may be an exception. There is a small amount of evidence from the study to support this assertion. For consecutive statements of two of the non-consensus groups, similar relationships between orientation and other variables were found. In the discussions on women's hours and grading, there were significant relationships between the orientation of the first statement in each pair and the opinionatedness and objectivity of the second statement. In addition, the relationships for the two questions were in the same direction. On women's hours, the correlations between the orientation of the first statements and the opinionatedness and objectivity of the second were -.33 and .28 respectively. On grading, the correlations were -.28 and .50. This evidence suggests that additional research on the relationships between consecutive statements when orientation is one of the variables may be profitable.

In general, studying simple relationships between consecutive statements does not appear to be a sophisticated enough approach to yield meaningful information about communication processes in group discussions. The relationships among statements are probably much more complex than can be detected by simple correlational analyses. Future research should concentrate on relationships among multiple statements. Instead of being contingent upon the value of the immediately preceding statement, the value of a given discussion statement on a particular variable may be contingent upon the values of the three, four, or five preceding statements on the same or other variables. We should attempt to determine if this possibility is tenable.

If consistent relationships among multiple statements are found by doing the kind of research which I have suggested, then eventually it may be possible to develop controlled experiments in which discussants are trained to inject into discussions certain kinds of statements. In this way it will be possible to determine more precisely how communication patterns can affect the outcomes of discussions.

On the basis of results from this phase of the investigation, the only conclusion which seems to be justified is that consecutive statements in discussions by non-consensus groups appear to be less independent than the statements of consensus groups, but the dependencies between consecutive statements in these non-consensus groups vary from question to question.

REFERENCES

1. Harold Guetzkow and John Gyr, "An Analysis of Conflict in Decision-Making Groups," Human Relations, VII(1954), 380.

2. Ibid.

3. John W. Bowers, "Language Intensity, Social Introversion, and Attitude Change" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1962).

4. Wendel L. Thompson, "Message Intensity as a Variable in the Application of the Congruity Principle and Message Discrepancy Theory" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1965).

5. Halbert E. Gulley, Discussion, Conference, and Group Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 120.

6. J. O. Whittaker, "Attitude Change and Communication-Attitude Discrepancy," Journal of Social Psychology, LXV(1965), 141-147.

7. L. LaFave and Muzafer Sherif, "Reference Scales and Placement of Items with the Own Categories" (unpublished manuscript, Norman, Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations, 1962), cited by Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif, Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 120.

8. J. Reich and Muzafer Sherif, "Ego-Involvement as a Factor in Attitude Assessment by the Own Categories Technique" (unpublished manuscript, Norman, Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations, 1963), cited by Sherif and Sherif, p. 120.

9. Sherif and Sherif, p. 115.

10. Morton Deutsch, "A Theory of Cooperation and Competition," Human Relations, II (1949), 129-152.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS, AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Since so little is known about consensus, and since it is one of the major goals of group communication, this study was designed to identify variables which distinguish consensus groups from non-consensus groups in discussions on questions of policy. The two major questions to be answered were:

1. Are the statements (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) of discussion groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus distinguishable from the statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?

2. Are the relationships (in terms of clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length) between consecutive statements of discussion groups which closely approach or actually reach consensus different from the relationships between consecutive statements of discussion groups which remain far from consensus?

The eight variables to be investigated were selected from an original list of sixteen, including clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, length, relevance, emotionality, competence, friendliness, cooperativeness, redundancy, agreement, and controversy. Fifty statements from five different discussions were rated by groups of four and five judges on each of the variables except length, which was determined by word count. The reliability of the judges' combined ratings on a variable and the independence of the variable were the two criteria used as guides in compiling the final list.

The instructors of thirty sections of beginning rhetoric at the University of Iowa agreed to allow their students to participate in the project. A questionnaire containing six questions of policy was distributed to the classes. Each item on the questionnaire was followed by a description of the present policy, four alternative policies, and a space in which the respondent could describe a fifth if he found none of the others to be satisfactory. The explicitly stated alternatives were chosen to represent increasingly liberal departures from the present policy. Each respondent was asked to select one of the policies on each of the questions and to indicate on a scale below the policy descriptions how strongly he believed in his choice. The questionnaire data provided the bases for selecting discussion questions and participants.

The following three questions for discussion were chosen from the original list of six:

1. What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?
2. What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduate students' possession of automobiles on campus?
3. What should be the University's policy on grading?

Six students from each class were asked to participate in an impromptu discussion on one of the three questions. Although all could not be met in every case, the following criteria were used as guides in forming the discussion groups:

1. Each group should have six members.
2. Three members of each group should have endorsed the present policy, and three should have endorsed the most liberal of the explicitly stated policies.
3. Each group should have three male and three female participants.
4. All members of the same sex in a given group should not have endorsed the same policy.

Ten groups were tentatively assigned to discuss each question. One of the groups tentatively assigned to discuss the first question, however, was later reassigned to discuss the second question.

Each discussion was held under as nearly identical conditions as possible. After reporting to the University's Television Center, the members of each group were escorted to a room where they were given the question for discussion, a set of instructions containing a description of the present policy and list of alternatives, and a discussion agenda. Each group was told that its discussion would be recorded for the purpose of analyzing the kinds of issues which arise in discussions. The recorder was then started, and the students were left alone to discuss their question. After each discussion, the participants were asked to indicate their positions on the question which they had discussed and also on the two which they had not discussed.

Six of the discussions were selected for further study. Of these, two each had discussed the same question. One of each pair had reached consensus, and the other had remained some distance from consensus.

Fifty pairs of statements were transcribed from the recording of each discussion. The first statement of each pair was selected at random. The second statement was the one which immediately followed the first in that discussion. During the transcription of the statements, a context was provided for those statements which, in isolation, could have referred to many different things, but which did not in the actual discussions.

Five judges, all graduate students in the Department of Speech at the University of Iowa, rated all of the statements on clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, and objectivity. Length was measured separately by word count. No two judges rated the statements in the same order--a precaution taken to control for order effects.

When the judges had completed their task, the reliability coefficient for each variable was computed. Although the reliability of the individual ratings was low, the reliability of the combined judges' ratings was high enough to warrant continuing with the investigation. A check on the independence of the variables revealed that some shared as much as fifty percent common variance with others; nevertheless, all of the variables seemed to be different enough to justify individual study.

Three kinds of analyses of the data were made. First, a separate two-factor analysis of variance on the scores assigned to the first statement in each pair was made for each of the eight variables. These analyses were to determine if the statements of consensus groups could be distinguished from the statements of non-consensus groups. Second, the value assigned to the first statement in each pair on a given variable was correlated with the value assigned to the second statement on the same variable. Forty-eight correlation coefficients were computed, one for each group on each variable. Third, the value assigned to the first statement in each pair of statements was correlated with the values assigned to the second statement on every other variable. These correlational analyses were to determine if the value of one statement is contingent upon the value of the statement which precedes it, either in terms of the same variable or in terms of other variables, and if the contingencies differ for consensus and non-consensus groups.

The analyses of variance revealed that the statements of consensus groups were indistinguishable from the statements of non-consensus groups on either clarity or length. On the remaining variables, differences between consensus and non-consensus groups were found, but they were not consistent for all three questions. The results on opinionatedness, amount of information, provocativeness, and objectivity were similar. For all four variables, the only significant difference which was found between the statements of consensus and non-consensus groups was for the groups discussing women's hours. The statements of the consensus group were significantly less opinionated, more informative, more provocative, and more objective than the statements of the non-consensus group. The results on interest were even less consistent than those for the preceding variables. In the discussions on women's hours, the statements of the consensus group manifested significantly greater interest than the statements of the non-consensus group, but in the discussions on undergraduates' possession of automobiles, just the opposite result was found. The results on orientation were more uniform than on any of the other seven variables. The statements of the consensus groups discussing women's hours and grading were significantly higher on this attribute than the statements of the corresponding non-consensus groups.

Virtually no relationship between consecutive statements was found in those contingency analyses in which the value of the first statement in each pair of statements on a given variable and the value of the second statement on the same variable were correlated. Only three of the forty-eight correlations were significant, and even these indicated only slightly better than chance relationships.

The correlations of the value of the first statement in each pair of discussion statements with the values of the second statement on all other variables revealed several significant relationships. Most of these, however, were weak. Practically none of the correlations for the consensus groups were significant. Although a substantial number of the correlations for the non-consensus groups were significant, they so varied from question to question that meaningful generalizations could not be drawn.

Conclusions

A detailed examination of the results for each of the analyses was made, and several conclusions were drawn, all of which are presented in Chapter IV. They are restated here in list form:

1. Clarity does not ordinarily appear to be related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy.

2. Length, within reasonable limits, does not appear to be related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy.

3. Opinionatedness, provocativeness, and objectivity are not consistently related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy, but, when they are, the statements of consensus groups will be less opinionated, more provocative, and more objective than the statements of non-consensus groups.

4. Amount of information is not consistently related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy, but, when it is, the statements of consensus groups will contain more information than the statements of non-consensus groups.

5. On questions of policy, the statements of consensus groups are sometimes distinguishable from the statements of non-consensus groups in the level of interest they reflect, but the direction of these differences is not consistent.

6. Orientation is generally related to the outcomes of discussions on questions of policy. The statements of consensus groups will be higher in orientation than the statements of non-consensus groups.

7. Regardless of the outcome of a discussion, there appears to be no strong relationship between the value of one statement and the value of the following statement on the same variable. This generalization holds for clarity, opinionatedness, interest, amount of information, provocativeness, orientation, objectivity, and length.

8. Consecutive statements in discussions by non-consensus groups appear to be less independent than the statements of consensus groups, but the dependencies between consecutive statements in these non-consensus groups vary from question to question.

Implications for Future Research

Substantive Implications

Since it was possible to distinguish the statements of consensus groups from the statements of non-consensus groups (although not consistently) on six of the eight variables investigated in this study, small group research may now be a step closer to discovering the kind of information which will ultimately help us to understand those factors which inhibit and promote consensus.

Throughout the discussion of results in Chapter IV, specific suggestions for additional research were offered. Most of them focused on identifying more precisely the kinds of questions, issues, and groups for which the variables examined in this study make a difference. Once we are a little more confident about the kinds of situations in which these variables affect the probability of achieving consensus, we may be able to plan controlled experiments in which communication behavior is manipulated to affect the outcomes of discussions. With the possible exception of orientation, this type of research would be premature for the variables which I studied.

One problem with which future research must come to grips eventually is the interaction between what discussants say and how they say it. Had my judges been able to hear the discussants, they might have assigned different ratings to some statements on some variables. This might also have increased the reliability and accuracy of their judgments. For a study of the interaction between the content of statements and the form of expression to be manageable, one would need to deal with a small number of variables, say, one or two at a time; nevertheless, studies of this relationship should be made.

Future research efforts should also concentrate on discovering the relationships of additional variables to the outcomes of discussions. Tact, submissiveness, hostility, and argumentativeness are four variables which might be worthy of investigation. Perhaps by rating statements on these kinds of characteristics, rather than on characteristics like clarity, amount of information, interest, and length, we could begin to see more clearly the kinds of interpersonal relationships that develop in discussions.

A statement rated low in tact or high in hostility, no doubt, would be a better indicator of how an individual is reacting to others than a statement which is rated high in clarity. The level of argumentativeness and submissiveness reflected in discussion statements may also be better indicators of how individuals are attempting to affect and are affected by others than, say, length, interest, or amount of information.

Perhaps some of the variables which are indicative of interpersonal relationships may be more systematically related to the outcomes of discussions than many of the variables examined in this study. If this is true, then we may also find more systematic relationships among statements on such variables. We should at least attempt to discover if these possibilities are tenable.

One final suggestion for future research is that more attention be paid to the statements of individual discussants. We should compare the statements of participants who change their positions during a discussion with the statements of participants who do not. In Chapter IV, I suggested an investigation of this type on interest because it appeared to be related to the pattern of movement toward consensus. The same thing could be done for other variables. Discovering what is characteristic of the statements of people who change and those who do not might provide some insights about the relationships of certain variables to the outcomes of discussions.

Methodological Implications

Most of the discussion in this chapter and the preceding one has focused on the substantive aspects of the investigation. Most of the remainder of this chapter is devoted to the methodological implications, since this was in large part a study of methodology.

If this study can be considered unique, its uniqueness lies primarily in the use of statements rather than individuals as dependent variables. The results of the investigation indicate that this method is useful in dealing with certain kinds of questions about group communication. This is not to say that the technique is without problems. One must be able to define variables in such a manner that judges can detect varying degrees of each property in individual statements, which is not an easy task. In addition, sole reliance on the ratings of statements excludes from consideration other kinds of information which may be valuable in helping to explain discussion behavior.

Despite its problems, there are several advantages of the methodology of this study which may make it useful for other kinds of small group research. First, it is relatively efficient. The use of statements instead of individuals as the unit of study enables one to make much greater use of the information which he has at his disposal. He can study only a few groups and yet have a great deal of material to analyze. In addition, he can apply sophisticated statistical procedures in the analysis of data and not be concerned with the problem of having a large enough sample to detect differences between groups.

A second advantage is that the methodology can be used to measure discussion behavior unobtrusively. It was not so used in this study, but in others it could be. Discussions could be recorded without the participants' knowledge. One could then simply study their statements to obtain information about discussion behavior without having to worry about the possible reactivity of his measuring instruments on the discussants' behavior.

Another advantage of this approach to small group research is that it enables investigators to make maximum use of the content of discussions. The approach yields the kind of information which should be of more interest to scholars in the field of speech than the kinds of research which ignore the content of discussions. If we are concerned with the relationship between what people say in discussions and the achievement of their goals, as I think we should be, then this methodology has some significance.

A final advantage of using statements in investigations of group communication behavior is that it enables one to do research in more natural kinds of settings than other methodologies permit. We know, for example, that majority pressure can affect the judgment of deviants in highly artificial kinds of situations, but we know very little about the ways in which such pressure manifests itself in classroom discussions, business conferences, and the like. By studying statements perhaps we can eliminate some of the artificiality which is characteristic of much of the research in group communication.

Educational Implications

While the conclusions of this study are only tentative, they do seem to have some definite implications for the teaching of discussion. The statements of consensus groups could be distinguished from those of non-consensus groups--at least part of the time--on six of the variables which I investigated. A discussion teacher would not be justified in telling his students that to promote consensus, they must make only certain kinds of statements; however, he would appear to be justified in pointing out to them that making certain kinds of statements in discussions in which opinions are evenly and sharply divided over issues which give rise to certain kinds of conflict increases the probability of reaching consensus.

My results suggest that groups whose members make statements that are relatively unopinionated, informative, provocative, objective, and helpful in resolving conflict have a greater probability of reaching consensus than groups whose statements are relatively more opinionated, less informative, less provocative, and unhelpful in resolving conflict. These findings substantiate what some people who teach discussion have long suspected on intuitive and experiential bases.

We now have some empirical support for suggesting to students desirable behavioral patterns, but we are not as yet able to say why such behavior patterns bear the relationship to consensus that they do. The teacher who would like to use the information gathered in this study must be careful not to mislead students. The relationship between the kinds of statements which discussants make and reaching consensus is probablistic, not causal. In any given case, a group could not be assured of reaching consensus simply by making statements which have the kinds of properties identified in this study.

Without additional research, the generalizability of my findings is limited only to groups like those which I examined. The relationship between the variables which were investigated and the outcomes of discussions may be different, for example, among groups in which initial opinion is not so sharply and evenly divided. To generalize beyond the types of groups which participated in the investigation, at this time, would appear to be unjustifiable.

Concluding Comment

Although a great deal remains to be learned about consensus in group discussions, this study may have brought us a little closer to understanding the phenomenon. It has demonstrated in some instances that there are detectable differences in the discussion behavior of groups which reach consensus and groups which do not. The contribution of the study, however small, is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step. Unless additional and improved research of the types suggested is carried out, then we shall remain largely ignorant about an important, if not the most important, objective of group communication.

APPENDIX A

FIFTY DISCUSSION STATEMENTS RATED IN THE PRELIMINARY STUDY

The following ten statements are from a discussion of birth control on the University of Iowa campus.

__________ 1. "Well, this is something I think we oughta, you know, try to agree on. What is, uh, what is the main reason that a girl would want to have, you know, birth control? Security?"

__________ 2. "Well, I disagree with that because I think it, uh, it's still a personal judgment, and, uh, from most people I know there are certain things in every church that certain people don't agree with, and it's still a personal and mor personal moral, uh, standard that you have to set by yourself, and I think that's where the, well, through education and, uh, education of the use of contraceptives is what's gonna be needed."

__________ 3. "But who's going to make the decision on whether the pill should, uh, be brought out or not or the contraceptives should be let out? It's not the the person that goes in to get it. It's the person that, uh, makes it available."

__________ 4. "Society controls it from the fact of the double standard which I I do you, does everyone know what the double standard is? And also they they control it from the fact that, you know, it it just isn't right. And, I mean, uh, the the impression, for instance, of a girl who gets pregnant out of wedlock, I mean, on the university campus it's different. I'll grant you that, but in in your typical American community, the girl who gets pregnant, her next door neighbors shun her, her friends shun her, the whole bit. The double standard is set up, which is set up by our society, which is a moral issue."

__________ 5. "I think that it was brought out earlier in relevance to this that if a girl or a guy, uh, believes in premarital sex, why, uh, he's gonna go ahead and do it. Now, if he if he doesn't believe in in it, he will not do it whether or not contraceptives are available to him. And I believe it's the same for a guy or a girl. If you, uh, if you believe yourself that it's it's morally wrong, it will make no difference whether or not these devices are available to you. I think that that is true."

__________ 6. "Yah, because I I don't think that the pill, for instance, or other contraceptives, whichever you're going to use, the pill seems seems to be the most safe for at least relief relief of the mind. Uh, I think when a girl comes on campus that, uh, she, uh, you gonna know. I mean, she'll know within the first year or two whether she's going to sleep with every Tom, Dick, and Harry on campus or, you know, what her feelings are towards permarital sex. And, uh, I think, personally, I believe that we should formulate a policy where the Student Health Center does provide birth control pills for unmarried students."

__________ 7. "As long as this church idea's been brought up, I'd like to, a friend of mine who was a former seminary student, he was a seminary student for three years in the Catholic, uh, seminary, and, uh, he was talking to a bishop, and the bishop said that the only reason that the the Catholic Church came out against, uh, birth control in the first place was because, uh, many, many years ago, I can't remember what Pope it was, he said that, uh, well, birth control is a bad deal, you know, you know. That's all he said. He didn't way that we should not do something. He just said, 'Well, I think,' or something like this, and it's been interpreted ever since then that he came out and said exactly that birth control should not be done by Catholics, uh, who are trying to be good good devout Catholics. And, uh, this person, well, he agreed, I agree with him entirely because, uh, upon research I found this to be true that there wasn't any set, uh, principle. He didn't say, 'Well, uh, don't do it,' you know, things like that, and, uh, so I think it's pretty much just hearsay as why as to why he, uh, this, uh, whole idea that the Catholic Church is against, uh uh, birth control."

__________ 8. "Uh, the only decision that should be made is by the person who uses it. When to use it and if to use it."

__________ 9. "Well, this is where the birth control pills can come in."

__________10. "And then can we go on to say that, uh, birth control, uh, devices and pills and, uh, possibly, even doctors who can perform an abortion should be should be available at Student Health, and this is our policy?"

The next set of ten statements are from a discussion of what the University of Iowa's policy on women's hours should be.

__________ 1. "OK, so we've got, uh, two problems here: whether the the age or, uh, the year involved and depending on parental permission. Well, let's decide how we're going to attack this problem and how it shall be set up. Uh, should we, uh, say just women under 21 or undergraduates or, uh, narrow just to sophomores and freshmen? Any discussion on that?"

__________ 2. "All right, so the criteria we got set up now are, uh, the right of the individual girl and the inconsistencies in the system and the University's moral obligation."

__________ 3. "All right, I've talked to several girls that if they think they're gonna be ten minutes late or more, they'll stay out all night, uh, rather than take the chance of coming in late and having to go in front of Judic."

__________ 4. "You know, so you, I mean, compare, we have to compare what we know about other schools and then set up the policy."

__________ 5. "OK, excuse me for, let's start this again. First of all, on one hand, there'll be no restrictions whatsoever, regardless of what their parents say. On the other hand, they will have restrictions if their, pardon me, total restrictions or unrestricted with parental permission. All right?"

__________ 6. "Well, I think we've already established that juniors and seniors don't have hours, so why don't we work on the freshmen and sophomores, if they should or should not have them?"

__________ 7. "Don't you think we oughta throw in some kind of parental, uh, consent in this?"

__________ 8. "Well now, what are the consequences if you do come in late as opposed to staying out all night?"

__________ 9. "I was gonna say I think there is a tendency though to, uh, towards a leniency because it matters, so now, uh, freshmen are the only ones that have hours, and they have certain signouts a month, certain number depending upon their, uh, their standing, academic standings, whether like, you know, on probation or not on probation, and what grade point is. I mean, it sounds a little bit ridiculous, uh, that a grade point should determine, but this is the type of policy they set up. But sophomores, juniors, and seniors have absolutely no hours at all. And I know at Northwestern the same policy is being enforced now. And it just seems like there's a general tendency now to move toward, uh, more freedom for girls."

__________10. "Vote, uh, restriction with parental, uh, parental restriction."

The next set of ten statements are from a discussion of what should be done about the parking problem at the University of Iowa.

__________ 1. "Well, it's like, say, if you, it's the same thing as, like national defense bonds. Say, uh, they issue bonds, which means, uh, they'll pay, I don't know what their standard is, maybe 4½, 5 percent, on a bond in a twenty year period so that, it's it's just the same way you build your schools and, uh, no tax."

__________ 2. "But wo won't they be overcrowded? I mean, I would assume that we would be able to use these five with just student cars."

__________ 3. "If we can show a need, if if if we can show that these influential people realize the need and want something done about it, the, uh, the general public will go, uh, you, will pretty assuredly go along, I think."

__________ 4. "The location, I think, could be worked out, but once we have to sell the idea. I think this is the main problem, uh, that we have to worry about is selling the idea, and, uh, against, uh, other, uh, ideas that are going to be brought up in in saying for other reasons saying, well, perhaps, this shuttle bus. How can we shoot down this shuttle bus idea? I, uh, I think we have to concen concentrate on that."

__________ 5. "Well, this is this would be one thing. This is a good thing that we would have to check into then. I think we should find out what plans are are on the boards. What do they now have on in plan? They do have a parking overall parking picture. Iowa City has one, the University has one, and I think we oughta assign someone to find out what their plans are and then report back next time. Find out what is in the wind. Maybe they do have something like this already."

__________ 6. "Does it just pay for everything?"

__________ 7. "Well, it all depends. These would be the facts and figures that we would have to research out and find."

__________ 8. "I don't know how many of you re remember, but I think sometime last fall the City Council, at a City Council meeting someone proposed that University cars with the University student sticker on it be banned from parking in the downtown area in certain streets. And someone else came up and said, 'Well, this'd be the rankest,' I remember this quote, 'rankest kind of discrimination.' So it didn't go through. So I'm sure that they at least realize that there is a problem of this nature and would support us."

__________ 9. "I agree. I I think we're being premature talking about, worrying so much about specific locations right now. Uh, I think we definitely need facts and figures and so forth like is there available space, uh, you know, cost of things. You know, maybe you should do research, find out how much people are willing, you know, to plug in a parking meter for one hour. This sort of thing. Uh, maybe you should find out what they're doing on other campuses and other, you know, places that are having parking problems. Find out about University-City cooperation. Maybe you should find out about, uh, the logistics of, uh, private, uh, commercial parking ramp. Maybe, uh, instead of putting all sorts of pressure on, uh, the legislature and so forth to build a parking ramp, maybe we form a corporation and build our own parking ramp. You know, maybe maybe there's money in it. We don't know. I so I think we have to find out these facts and figures, but we don't have them now."

__________10. "We're basically trying to set up how we're going, say, how how we're going to do this, how we shall implement it."

The next set of ten statements is from a discussion of what the role of the University in the student's non-academic life should be.

__________ 1. "I always wondering when these individuals will be able to control themselves though. When will they be able to break the bind between the parents and make up their own minds what they are going to do and when they are going to do it? Why do they always have to have some authority standing over them telling them, 'You get in by this time, you get in by that time'? When are they going to stand up and say, 'I'm going to do this when I want to because I want to do it'?"

__________ 2. "You you're saying we should then live in dorms without, you're propo, you're suggesting maybe we could let them live in the dorms without rules? You're saying if they are to live in the dorms?"

__________ 3. "I mean, I think it is because, if you, if they decided right now that they weren't going to require people to live in that dorm, then if they wanted to fill that dorm, because of financial reasons, they'd have to to do away with their restrictions in that dorm. I mean, I think they're all very connected."

__________ 4. "Plus the fact that Iowa is is a very conservative state, and the the money that the University receives is from alumni and from, you know, uh, mostly in state, you know, parents parents and, uh, taxpayers, and, as a result, the rules of the University are pretty much conservative, representative of what the population feels, I think."

__________ 5. "I think that the University realizes that it that it's happening. I don't think that that the, uh, whoever is governing, you know, what's going on is ignorant of all this because some of the actions that they've taken recently. They they're starting to talk an awful lot about coed dorms, and the reason that they're talking about coed dorms is because they're losing so many students who who are, you know, male students who are just moving out of the dorms because, uh, it's inconvenient, and there are too many rules, you know, and and the, in order to, uh, keep the students in the dorms, they're trying a new policy of, uh, coed dorms, you know, and they're taking votes and looking into it, and I think that they are looking for ways out and ways to liberalize, you know, in order to keep the students happy. But they just, you know, don't realize how how liberal they have to be."

__________ 6. "I think you you've got a pretty good argument going whether the university's rules do, uh, actually make it easier for students to succeed academically. For instance, how about the underclassman girls who have to get out of the library before it closes at 2 o'clock and have to be back in the dorm at at 12 o'clock? And maybe they're working on a paper, and they need to get those research materials."

__________ 7. "Well, without the same kind of rules they have now. Let them make their own rules."

__________ 8. "I think we're what we're trying to decide is the University's attitude toward the, uh, control of the student's private life. Should they interfere to a greater extent or to a lesser extent than what they are doing right now?"

__________ 9. "It's not quite as conservative as a lot of people believe. As far as as open houses are concerned, one of the dorms, what, which dorm was it, had an open house where girls could come in. And this was illegal, but it was, they let it pass, and the CSL took it up. And, uh, the people wanted open housing where the girls could come up on certain days on certain days brought, you know, brace work where the doors would have to be open 45 degree angle and all this. And CSL, this group of supposedly conservative faculty members, says, 'What's all this business about 45 degrees? It's all right.' The main opinion was it would be OK to have girls up in your rooms on certain days and not not to have 45 degree angles or any specific things or great paternal organization. But it should be restricted to certain days and not, you know, one big Whoopie, which is, I think, which is one point which is carrying it too far. You have to go along with the rules of the state like on drinking, and you have the problems of living in a dorm, of, you know, having a couple of thousand kids living in a very close area, and you have to realize that respecting the other people in the dorm is very important too. And most of your restrictions are guided towards that."

__________10. "And they're willing to reduce girls' hours. They've tried the last two years, and they've taken polls, and it's come out that that the girls wanted hours, the freshman and sophomore girls."

The final set of ten statements are from a discussion of how best to improve the United States' Selective Service System.

__________ 1. "Yah, where the controversy has been up to now is that, uh, some of these students get started. They have, uh, well, a month or two or perhaps a semester graduate school under their belt, and all of a sudden they're pulled out, uh, pulled out and into the army. The trouble up to this point has been that no set, there has been no uniform standard, which is something that I would hope we would use for criteria: uniformity in the local draft boards. But, uh, separate draft boards have been picked pulling people out of, uh graduate school with, uh, out any warning whatsoever just to fill state quotas and to fill their local quota."

__________ 2. "I thought under the lottery system they're gonna put everybody's name in a hat, so to speak, and at least, you know, for the first year and then draw from there."

__________ 3. "Then again, though maybe this--I'm sorry, I'm probably skipping the subject a little bit--but, uh, drafting some of the college students, you can consider that a lot of these college students are in the in college merely to escape the draft, and that would make it a little more fair if it were just, you know, ordinary, you know, Rah, college students."

__________ 4. "And there aren't enough people to have, uh, that have that large a turnover."

__________ 5. "I think they, myself, I think they should be deferred. I mean, uh, a person that's going to actually go on to graduate work, he's evidently pretty interested in what he's doing. I don't think he just doing it to, uh, avoid college. And you have to have, really, some brains to get through graduate school. I mean, it's possible to get through undergraduate school a lot more easily than it is through graduate school."

__________ 6. "I think, Terry, we can never have any criteria on this point because there's, I think, there's, uh, I think it's either 500 or 1000 different draft boards or 5000 different draft boards. Each one has a different policy, so Polk County will be different from Johnson County most likely. So we can never set up a sure criteria on this because, uh, because Des Moines County, where Des Moines is, they might have no trouble with, uh, a need. They might not be hurting for draftable boys. They might have a ready, uh, supply where a smaller county might not."

__________ 7. "But they'll leave this to the local, like draft boards now, since they're not gonna do away with the local independent draft boards, so each, I think, each draft board will have their, uh, their own say if they want a lottery or the present system. That's the way I understand it now."

__________ 8. "I think another thing that's very important if you would go in when you're 19, those that would have gone to college when they're 19 and had the money and facilities and stuff, they're gonna go in when they're 21, well, two years in the army. They're gonna go in when they're 21 anyway. I mean, if if it's that important for them to go in at 19, two years will not make the difference. It will not probably hurt them because they're on the same level as everybody else. I mean, it's just like moved up two years. Uh, I think they'll be, uh, going to college at the same percent, and I think, uh, probably even take college a lot more seriously and possibly get more out of it because the army will straighten up a kid."

__________ 9. "What do you mean by that large a turnover?"

__________ 10. "I tend to look at the evil in things, but I think a lot of these grad students are going to grad school merely to, you know, get away from the draft."

APPENDIX B

INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO PARTICIPATING RHETORIC CLASSES

NAME____

INSTRUCTOR____

HOUR AT WHICH CLASS MEETS_________________________

INSTRUCTIONS: You are being asked to express your opinion on several questions in which many of our undergraduate students have shown a great deal of interest. Please read each question carefully and then put an X in the blank next to the alternative which best represents your opinion. If you place an X by the last alternative on any of the questions, be sure to specify in writing what your opinion is. The second thing which I would like for you to do is to indicate how strongly you believe in the alternative which you have chosen. Do this by placing another X in one of the blanks on the belief scale which has been placed below the list of alternatives. An example is provided below. Please answer each of the questions as honestly as possible. Your responses will be kept in the strictest confidence, and they will in no way influence your grade in this course. Your instructor has agreed to give six of you a chance to discuss one of these questions at a later time. I need this opinion information in order to determine who the six will be. Thank you for your cooperation.

EXAMPLE

What should be the University's policy concerning the sale of liquor at the Iowa Memorial Union?

_____ A. Under the present policy, no liquor of any kind is sold at the IMU. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. Beer should be sold to adult guests of the University on special occasions.
__X__ C. Beer should be sold to students over 21 only on weekends.
_____ D. Beer should be sold to students over 21 at any time the IMU is open.
_____ E. All kinds of alcoholic beverages should be sold to students over 21 at any time the IMU is open.

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

1. What should be the University's policy on housing for undergraduates?

_____ A. Under the present policy, unmarried undergraduates less than 21 years old must live either in dormitories or in "approved housing." This policy should be maintained.

_____ B. The essentials of the present policy should be maintained, but the list of "approved housing" should be expanded.

_____ C. Female undergraduates should be under the present policy, but male undergraduates should be allowed to live wherever they wish.
_____ D. The essentials of the present policy should be maintained, but undergraduates should be permitted to live wherever they wish with parental approval.
_____ E. All undergraduates should be permitted to live wherever they wish.
_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

2. What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

_____ A. Under the present policy, most undergraduate women must be in their housing units by midnight from Sunday through Thursday and by 1 A.M. on Friday and Saturday nights. However, Juniors and Seniors may be exempted from these regulations with parental approval, and all undergraduate women at least 21 years old are exempted. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. The present policy should be maintained for Freshman and Sophomores, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ C. The present policy should be maintained for Freshmen, Sophomores should be exempted with parental approval, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ D. Each women's housing unit should make its own rules concerning hours.
_____ E. No undergraduate women should have hours.
_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

3. What should be the University's policy on the acquisition and distribution of undergraduate textbooks?

_____ A. Under the present policy, textbooks are bought and sold by privately owned bookstores although the Student Senate occasionally sponsors a book exchange. This policy should be maintained.

_____ B. The University should establish and maintain a non-profit cooperative book and supply store much like the privately owned bookstores.

_____ C. The University should establish and maintain a non-profit cooperative store for the sale of required textbooks, but not other books and supplies.

_____ D. The University should establish and maintain a rental service for all required undergraduate textbooks.

_____ E. The University should request appropriations in order to distribute free required textbooks to all undergraduate students, recalling the books for further use at the end of each semester.

_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

4. What should be the role of students in the administration's decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members?

_____ A. Under the present policy, student evaluations are not used officially as a basis for administrative decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members. This policy should be maintained.

_____ B. Student evaluations should be one of the minor bases for administrative decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members.

_____ C. Student evaluations should be one of the major bases for administrative decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members.

_____ D. Student evaluations should be given more consideration than any other factor in administrative decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members.

_____ E. Student evaluations should be the only basis for administrative decisions concerning the retention and promotion of faculty members.

_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

5. What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?

_____ A. Under the present policy, most Freshmen and Sophomores living in University housing may not have an automobile on campus. Juniors and Seniors may have automobiles on campus if they register them with the University. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. The present policy should be broadened so that Sophomores living in University housing who maintain a grade-point average above 3.0 may also have cars on campus.
_____ C. The present policy should be broadened so that Sophomores living in University housing may also have cars on campus.
_____ D. The present policy should be broadened so that both Sophomores and Freshmen living in University housing may also have automobiles on campus.
_____ E. All undergraduates should be allowed to have cars on campus without having to register them.
_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

6. What should be the University's policy on grading?

_____ A. Under the present policy, students are generally graded on an A to F scale. Juniors and Seniors may enroll in one course per semester on a Pass-Fail basis for a total of not more than 16 semester hours. These Pass-Fail courses must not be in their major field, and they must not be core courses. The grades from these courses do not count in the calculation of grade-point averages, but they do count toward credit for graduation. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, and the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours.
_____ C. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, the total amount of credit from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours, and it should be possible to take some core courses on a Pass-Fail basis.
_____ D. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, the total amount of credit from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours, and it should be possible to take all core courses on a Pass-Fail basis.
_____ E. All undergraduate students should be able to choose between a Pass-Fail system and an A to F system in all courses.
_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

APPENDIX C

DISCUSSION INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS

Policy on Women's Hours

INSTRUCTIONS: I am Dennis Gouran, a graduate assistant in the Communication Research Laboratory. The Laboratory has asked me to get a sample of considered student opinion on several questions in which many of the undergraduates at the University of Iowa have shown a great deal of interest. That is why I am asking you to discuss the question below. The results could have some implications for future policy. Your objective in the discussion should be to reach a decision on what seems to be most satisfactory answer to the question. This is not to say, of course, that you must reach complete agreement, but you should try. Be as open-minded as you can in coming to grips with the question. You have approximately forty minutes for your discussion. Perhaps you can use the time most profitably and efficiently if you follow the agenda on page 2. I am going to record the discussion for later analysis of the issues that come to light. I'll be in room 102N if you need anything. If you finish your discussion a few minutes early, please do not leave, but wait until I return. Once again, I wish to remind you that your participation in the discussion will in no way influence your grade in Rhetoric. Thank you for your cooperation.

QUESTION: What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

Under the present policy, most undergraduate women must be in their housing units by midnight from Sunday through Thursday and by 1 A.M. on Friday and Saturday nights. However, Juniors and Seniors may be exempted from these regulations with parental approval, and all undergraduate women at least 21 years old are exempted. Some possible alternatives to the present policy include:

1. maintaining the present policy for Freshmen and Sophomores, but exempting Juniors and Seniors without parental approval,
2. maintaining the present policy for Freshmen, exempting Sophomores with parental approval, but exempting Juniors and Seniors without parental approval,
3. allowing each women's housing unit to make its own rules concerning hours,
4. abolishing hours for undergraduate women.

Policy on Student's Possession of Automobiles

INSTRUCTIONS: I am Dennis Gouran, a graduate assistant in the Communication Research Laboratory. The Laboratory has asked me to get a sample of considered student opinion on several questions in which many of the undergraduates at the University of Iowa have shown a great deal of interest. That is why I am asking you to discuss the question below. The results could have some implications for future policy. Your objective in the discussion should be to reach a decision on what seems to be most satisfactory answer to the question. This is not to say, of course, that you must reach complete agreement, but you should try. Be as open-minded as you can in coming to grips with the question. You have approximately forty minutes for your discussion. Perhaps you can use the time most profitably and efficiently if you follow the agenda on page 2. I am going to record the discussion for later analysis of the issues that come to light. I'll be in room 102N if you need anything. If you finish your discussion a few minutes early, please do not leave, but wait until I return. Once again, I wish to remind you that your participation in the discussion will in no way influence your grade in Rhetoric. Thank you for your cooperation.

QUESTION: What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?

Under the present policy, most Freshmen and Sophomores living in University housing may not have an automobile on campus. Juniors and Seniors may have automobiles on campus if they register them with the University. Some of the possible alternatives to the present policy include:

1. broadening the present policy so that Sophomores living in University housing who maintain a grade-point average above 3.0 may also have cars on campus,
2. broadening the present policy so that Sophomores living in University housing may also have cars on campus, no matter what their grade-point average,
3. broadening the present policy so that Sophomores and Freshmen living in University housing may also have cars on campus,
4. allowing all undergraduate students to have cars on campus without having to register them.

Policy on Grading

INSTRUCTIONS: I am Dennis Gouran, a graduate assistant in the Communication Research Laboratory. The Laboratory has asked me to get a sample of considered student opinion on several questions in which many of the undergraduates at the University of Iowa have shown a great deal of interest. That is why I am asking you to discuss the question below. The results could have implications for future policy. Your objective in the discussion should be to reach a decision on what seems to be the most satisfactory answer to the question. This is not to say, of course, that you must reach complete agreement, but you should try. Be as open-minded as you can in coming to grips with the question. You have approximately forty minutes for your discussion. Perhaps you can use the time most profitably and efficiently if you follow the agenda on page 2. I am going to record the discussion for later analysis of the issues that come to light. I'll be in room 102N if you need anything. If you finish your discussion a few minutes early, please do not leave, but wait until I return. Once again, I wish to remind you that your participation in the discussion will in no way influence your grade in Rhetoric. Thank you for your cooperation.

QUESTION: What should be the University's policy on grading?

Under the present policy, students are generally graded on an A to F scale. Juniors and Seniors may enroll in one course per semester on a Pass-Fail basis for a total of not more than 16 semester hours. These Pass-Fail courses must not be in their major field, and they must not be core courses. The grades from these courses do not count in the calculation of grade-point averages, but they do count toward credit for graduation. Some possible alternatives to the present policy include:

1. broadening the present policy to include Sophomores and expanding the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses to 22 semester hours,
2. broadening the present policy to include Sophomores, expanding the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses to 22 semester hours, and making it possible to take some core courses on a Pass-Fail basis.
3. broadening the present policy to include Sophomores, expanding the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses to 22 semester hours, and making it possible to take all core courses on a Pass-Fail basis,
4. allowing all undergraduate students to choose between a Pass-Fail system and an A to F system in all courses.

APPENDIX D

DISCUSSION AGENDA

I. What, if any, disadvantages are there to the present policy? (10 to 15 minutes)

II. What would be the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed changes? (10 to 15 minutes)

III. Which of the alternatives or options shall we adopt? (10 to 15 minutes)

APPENDIX E

POST-DISCUSSION QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are three questions, one of which you have just completed discussing. Go directly to that question, and indicate what your present opinion is by checking one of the alternatives. Then indicate how strongly you believe in the alternative which you have chosen. Do the same thing for the other two questions even though you did not discuss them. Be sure to read each question and the alternatives carefully before indicating your opinion. Thank you.

1. What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?

_____ A. Under the present policy, most undergraduate women must be in their housing units by midnight from Sunday through Thursday and by 1 A.M. on Friday and Saturday nights. However, Juniors and Seniors may be exempted from these regulations with parental approval, and all undergraduate women at least 21 years old are exempted. This policy should be maintained.
_____ B. No undergraduate women should have hours.
_____ C. Each women's housing unit should make its own rules concerning hours.
_____ D. The present policy should be maintained for Freshmen, Sophomores should be exempted with parental approval, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ E. The present policy should be maintained for Freshmen and Sophomores, but Juniors and Seniors should be exempted without parental approval.
_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

2. What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?

_____ A. Under the present policy, most Freshmen and Sophomores living in University housing may not have an automobile on campus. Juniors and Seniors may have automobiles on campus if they register them with the University. This policy should be maintained.

_____ B. All undergraduates should be allowed to have cars on campus without having to register them.

_____ C. The present policy should be broadened so that both Sophomores and Freshmen living in University housing may also have automobiles on campus.

_____ D. The present policy should be broadened so that Sophomores living in University housing may also have cars on campus.

_____ E. The present policy should be broadened so that Sophomores living in University housing who maintain a grade-point average above 3.0 may also have cars on campus.

_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

3. What should be the University's policy on grading?

_____ A. Under the present policy, students are generally graded on an A to F scale. Juniors and Seniors may enroll in one course per semester on a Pass-Fail basis for a total of not more than 16 semester hours. These Pass-Fail courses must not be in their major field, and they must not be core courses. The grades for these courses do not count in the calculation of grade-point averages, but they do count toward credit for graduation. This policy should be maintained.

_____ B. All undergraduate students should be able to choose between a Pass-Fail system and an A to F system in all courses.

_____ C. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, the total amount of credit from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours, and it should be possible to take all core courses on a Pass-Fail basis.

_____ D. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, the total amount of credit from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours, and it should be possible to take some core courses on a Pass-Fail basis.

_____ E. The present policy should be broadened to include Sophomores, and the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses should be expanded to 22 semester hours.

_____ F. Other (Please specify)

How strongly do you believe in the alternative which you have chosen?

Not Strongly_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____Very Strongly

APPENDIX F

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO JUDGES IN THE FINAL STUDY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This package contains the following materials:

(1) Instructions for judging discussion statements on seven characteristics--one sheet for each characteristic.
(2) The three sets of instructions given to students discussing questions concerning the University's policy on hours for undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus, and the University's policy on grading.
(3) A set of 100 statements from each of six discussions.
(4) Twenty-four rating sheets--four for each of the six discussions.

Before continuing, make sure that you have all of the materials listed above.

The statements which you are being asked to judge have been selected at random from six impromptu discussions by Freshmen rhetoric students at the University of Iowa. You will notice that for some statements additional information has been included in brackets. This information has been provided only as a means of giving you a minimum amount of context for statements which in isolation could refer to an almost infinite number of different situations. The information is in no way intended as an indication of the investigator's opinion of a statement's importance.

The characteristics on which you are to judge the statements have been defined and illustrated on the seven pages immediately following these instructions. Each characteristic is to be rated on a seven point scale. Try to use the full range of scale values in making your judgments. In addition to the instructions for judging each of the characteristics, the instructions and suggested agenda given to the students have been included. You will find it helpful to read the discussants' instructions before beginning to judge the statements.

Following the discussants' instructions, you will find six sets of 100 statements. Each set has a Roman numeral on the first page. This number is the group identification number. The rating sheets have corresponding group identification numbers. Four rating sheets have been provided for each set of 100 statements. Be sure that you have the appropriate rating sheets for each set of statements before recording any judgments.

One column on the rating sheets has been allotted to each of the seven characteristics on which you will be judging the 600 discussion statements. The characteristics are identified with an Arabic numeral at the top of their respective columns on each rating sheet. This numeral corresponds to the numeral in the upper right hand corner of the instruction sheet for judging each of the characteristics. Be sure, in making your judgments, that you are entering numbers in the appropriate column.

Please use the following procedure in making your judgments. Rate all 600 statements on one characteristic at a time. The correct procedure is as follows:

> Assume that the first characteristic on which you are to judge the 600 statements is clarity. Judge the 100 statements from Group I first, from Group II second, from Group III third, etc., after having carefully read the instruction sheet for judging clarity. When your judgments of clarity have been completed, go on to the next characteristic. Read the appropriate instruction sheet, and then judge the 100 statements from Group I first, from Group II second, from Group III third, etc. Continue in this manner until you have judged all 600 statements on each of the characteristics.

To rate 600 statements on one characteristic will require approximately three hours. I suggest that you attempt to do no more than this at any one sitting. When you are judging, try to work rapidly, steadily, and, above all, independently. Avoid spending large amounts of time on any one statement. If you pass over any statement, be sure that you return to it and make a judgment. Do not leave any blanks even if you are dissatisfied with the judgment that you make. Please make all entries on the rating sheets in pencil. If you change your judgment on any item, please erase the entry on the rating sheet completely before recording the new entry. Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX G

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING SEVEN DISCUSSION VARIABLES

Objectivity

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on how objective you think it is. A statement is said to be objective when it reflects freedom from conscious attempts on the part of its maker to persuade or otherwise influence another person or persons toward his point of view. If you think that the statement is extremely objective, assign it a rating of 7. If you think that it is extremely unobjective, assign it a rating of 1. If you think that the statement falls midway between the extremes of objectivity, assign it a rating of 4. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate degrees of objectivity other than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

(1) "Let's consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of the proposed solution."
(2) "I can see that, but I still don't think the solution is a very good one."
(3) "Can't you see that the solution won't work?"

The first statement is very objective. The speaker is trying to consider all points of view. You would probably assign it a rating of 6 or 7. The second statement is only somewhat objective. You would probably assign it a rating of 4. The third statement is not at all objective. You would probably assign it a rating of 1, or 2 at most.

Clarity

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on the degree of clarity which you think it exhibits. A statement is said to be clear when an individual hearing or reading it feels confident that he understands what its maker means. If you think that the statement is extremely clear, assign it a rating of 7. If you think it is extremely unclear, assign it a rating of 1. If you think the statement falls midway between the extremes of clarity, assign it a rating of 4. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate other degrees of clarity other than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

> (1) "My understanding is that under the lottery system the name of those who will serve in the armed forces will be drawn at random."
> (2) "True, you can't say at this point whether the lottery system would be proportional or not, but it would probably turn out this way."
> (3) "But, Terry, this is your argument back here on criteria of making it fair for everybody. I mean you're never gonna have it clear cut, but you have to have the best of the worst ideas."

The first statement seems to be very clear. You would probably assign it a rating of 6 or 7. The second statement is fairly clear, but not as clear as the first. You would probably assign it a rating of 4 or, perhaps, even 5. The third statement is very unclear. One cannot always tell what the speaker is referring to. You would probably want to assign it a rating of 2 or, at most 3.

Opinionatedness

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on how opinionated it is. A statement is said to be opinionated when it expresses a feeling, belief, or judgment, the factual basis for which is not apparent in the statement itself. If you think that the statement is extremely opinionated, assign it a rating of 7. If you think it is not at all opinionated, assign it a rating of 1. If you think the statement falls midway between the extremes of opinionatedness, assign it a rating of 4. Make sure that you are judging the opinion of the person speaking. If someone were to say that "Governor Romney thinks that the President withheld troops from Detroit for political reasons," you would not judge the statement to be highly opinionated since the opinion expressed is that of someone other than the person speaking. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate other degrees of opinionatedness than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

> (1) "I think Johnson is a terrible president."
> (2) "The domestic and foreign problems which we face has led me to conclude that Johnson is an ineffective president."
> (3) "Our economic difficulties, such as unemployment, our failure to bring the war in Viet Nam to a peaceful conclusion, and the failure of the Anti-Poverty Program to exhibit any reasonable degree of effectiveness leads me to conclude that Johnson is not a very effective administrator."

All three statements are opinionated, but the second is less so than the first, and the third is less opinionated than either the first or second statements. You would probably assign a 7 to the first, a 4 to the second, and a 2 to the third. Do not base your ratings on whether or not you agree with the statement. Failure to pay attention to this suggestion can greatly distort your evaluation.

Interest

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on the degree of interest which you think it exhibits. A statement is said to reflect the interest of its maker if it contains some indication of concern or involvement on his part with the question being discussed. If you think that the speaker is very interested in the subject, assign his statement a rating of 7. If you think that he is very uninterested, assign his statement a rating of 1. If you think that he falls midway between the extremes of interest, assign his statement a 4. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate degrees of interest other than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

(1) "We must first agree on the basic cause of the problem before we can discuss any of the possible solutions."
(2) "One of the causes of the problem is administrative inefficiency."
(3) "None of us is qualified to discuss the problem. I don't see how we can arrive at a solution, so why bother?"

The first statement is that of a person who displays involvement. You would probably assign it a rating of 6 or 7. From the second statement one cannot tell how interested or uninterested the speaker is. You would probably assign the statement a rating of 4. The third speaker seems to be not at all interested in the discussion. You would probably assign the statement a rating of 1.

Amount of Information

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on the amount of information which you think it contains. A statement is said to be informative if it contains facts, statistics, and opinions of qualified sources which bear directly on some aspect of the question being discussed. If you think the statement is extremely informative, assign it a rating of 7. If you think that it is extremely uninformative, assign it a rating of 1. If you think that the statement falls midway between these extremes, assign it a rating of 4. Use the values 2, 3, 6, and 7 to indicate degrees of informativeness other than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

(1) "According to the Sec. of Defense in the last issue of U. S. News, we spent $20 billion to finance the war in Viet Nam last year."

(2) "According to some authorities domestic spending has to be cut if we are to finance the war in Viet Nam adequately."
(3) "Well, myself, I think we ought to pull out of Viet Nam."

The first statement seems to be very informative. You would probably assign it a rating of 6 or 7. The second statement is somewhat informative, but the information which it contains is not as specific as that contained in the first. You would probably assign it a rating of 3 or 4. The final statement is not very informative at all. You would probably assign it a rating of 1.

Provocativeness

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on how provocative you think it is. A statement is said to be provocative if it reflects a desire or willingness on the part of its maker to have another person make an overt response to it. If you think that the statement is highly provocative, assign it a rating of 7. If you think that the statement reflects a desire on the part of its maker to discourage others from making overt responses, assign it a rating of 1. If you think that the statement falls midway between these extremes, assign it a rating of 4. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate other degrees of provocativeness than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

(1) "Having considered the disadvantages of Communism, let's talk about its advantages."
(2) "I can think of at least three disadvantages to Communism."
(3) "Communism won't work. It never has, and it never will. That's all there is to that."

The first statement obviously welcomes the responses of others. You would probably assign it a rating of 7. The second statement seems neither to invite nor to discourage responses from others. You would probably assign it a rating of 4. The third response is highly dogmatic. The speaker apparently wants to hear no other point of view. You would probably assign it a rating of 1.

Orientation

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following pages are 600 contributions of individuals who participated in six different discussions. I would like for you to read each item carefully and then assign it a number between 1 and 7 depending on the extent to which you believe that it gives orientation. A statement is said to give orientation if it reflects an attempt on the part of its maker to facilitate achievement of a group's goal by using facts, making helpful suggestions, or trying to resolve conflict. If you think that the statement very obviously gives orientation, assign it a rating of 7? If you think that it obviously does not give orientation, assign it a rating of 1. If you think that the statement falls midway between these extremes, assign it a rating of 4. Use the values 2, 3, 5, and 6 to indicate degrees of giving orientation other than those specified above. Consider the following examples:

(1) "Perhaps we can get around the problem if we come at it from a different direction."
(2) "I don't understand why you can't agree with the rest of us. The evidence speaks for itself."
(3) "We'll never be able to agree on a solution."

The first statement is obviously intended to facilitate the achievement of a goal. You would probably assign it a rating of 6 or 7. The second statement also seems to be designed to help the group reach its goal, but the rather blunt manner of the speaker would probably do little to induce cooperation on the part of the person to whom he is speaking. You would probably assign it a rating of 3 or 4. The third statement reflects no desire on the part of its maker to help the group reach its goal. You would probably assign it a rating of 1.

APPENDIX H

SIX HUNDRED DISCUSSION STATEMENTS FROM SIX DISCUSSIONS ON THREE QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Consensus Group on Women's Hours

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?"

1. "The person best qualified to answer the first question is Sue Morton." (Referring to the first question on the discussion agenda)

2. "It says anybody over 21 is exempted now." (Referring to the description of the present policy on the discussants' instruction sheet)

3. "It's just Freshmen and Sophomores." (Referring to which students must observe hours)

4. "Do you want hours extended on weeknights? Just weekends?"

5. "I think most girls who come to school are coming, well, they want to have a little fun too, but I think they're serious minded seriously minded, you know. They wanta do their best. They might not be here very long, but I think they have enough common sense, and I think the ones that don't have enough common sense shouldn't be here, or they won't be here very long. I think there should be hours on weeknights, sure, but on weekends, I think, I think Freshmen should have hours, Sophomores with parents' permission."

6. "You said that if kids are gonna study here, they wouldn't, it wouldn't bother them if there were hours or weren't. I mean, if they had hours, and people really wanted to study, or they didn't, it wouldn't matter cause they'd study anyway. So all the hours, all the hours would be for is the kids who like to run around, or, you know, would, you know." (Interrupted at this point)

7. "There's some that don't." (Responding to a comment that most students realize that if they run around, they will not very likely be able to stay in school)

8. "I think that Sophomores should too now." (Referring to which students should have hours)

9. "I don't know. I don't run around. I don't, uh, you won't think very much of my roommate. Uh, I don't think she really ever studies, but she, but she gets better grades than I do, so just think, if she hardly ever studies, if she runs around all the time, but, uh, I think she'll pay for it in the end." (Responding to a question concerning what girls do when they run around)

10. "So what change do we want, the second one? Maintaining the present policy for Freshmen, exempting Sophomores with parental approval, and exempting Juniors and Seniors without parental approval."

11. "Well, I think most parents would allow their Juniors, you know." (Referring to exemption from the present policy on women's hours)

12. "You say if they mess around, they'll go around and pay for it in the end. Don't you think they should have some kind of, you know, some kind of restriction or something? Like if we're little enough, and our parents just let us do what we wanted, they'll say, 'Well, they'll pay for it in the end,' but some people can get in trouble."

13. "Well, I mean, does it hurt boys having hours?"

14. "What if girls could stay out all night?" (Responding to a comment that if women have hours, men go home and study)

15. "What do you think?" (Asking another discussant to make a comment on which policy he favors)

16. "They change in their Sophomore year."

17. "Does anybody have any ideas on the third proposal, allowing each unit to set its own hours?"

18. "Anybody think they should abolish all hours, or does everybody think they should keep?" (Interrupted at this point)

19. "I checked the fourth one. I don't know why. I figured they were discriminated against." (Referring to the fourth alternative on the discussants' instruction sheets)

20. "If no girls had hours, I think things would get out of hand."

21. "What is the present policy for Sophomores? Do they have hours?"

22. "So what are our proposed changes?"

23. "I would think that if a parent gave his permission, then Freshmen wouldn't necessarily have to have hours. I mean, it goes back to that point where a parent can judge his child better than the University, and it's kind of a strange coincidence because, well, I don't know. If the parents make up the decision, maybe, although some parents might just give you that, you know, not knowing."

24. "Well, if parents could always make a responsible decision, it would be all right. I mean, if the girls wouldn't stick a gun in their mother's back at the right time, it'd be okay." (Referring to exemption of Freshmen from the present policy with parental approval)

25. "I can go along with that plan because, well, like I said before, the parents are more capable of judging the individual student than the University is, and they should know when the child is mature enough to take a walk on his own or whether he still needs some restrictions, but that can be abused. I know quite a few kids who can pretty well handle their parents and get what they want out of them." (Referring to a plan to exempt Freshmen from the present policy with parental approval)

26. "A lot of Freshmen are more mature than Sophomores and Juniors."

27. "And they could probably have a different policy for like Freshmen if they had a certain grade point average and parental permission. I think that's, uh, grades seem to be quite important here, and if the student makes the grades, then that's what they're here to do. Well, they're not here exactly for grades. And if parents give permission, I don't see, you know, if everything's going all right for the student, why not extend his hours?"

28. "You don't mean that the grade point would, uh, for Juniors and Seniors?" (Responding to a proposal that students maintaining a certain grade point should be exempted from the present policy with parental approval)

29. "If the Freshmen girls have the grade point average, I I don't know what the average would be, but, and they do have parental approval, then they should be, you know, should be able to set their own hours."

30. "No, I think that they come here to, well, one of the reasons is to learn, and if you're they're not making the grades, they're obviously not learning a certain percentage of the material. They should have the hours."

31. "Second semester, they'd maintain, they'd have the average." (Referring to first semester Freshmen who might qualify for exemption from hours during their second semester)

32. "I think we should find out who checked what on this first question." (Referring to one of the alternatives on the discussants' instruction sheets)

33. "I said the fourth one, no hours for anybody, but I've changed now to two, but." (Interrupted at this point)

34. "I had checked number four."

35. "What about Freshmen? If they have parental approval and maybe the grade point average, they should be exempted too because there are

certain points where the difference between a Freshman and Sophomore is only about three months, and that is really nothing, no difference."

36. "I have a question. Why does the University have hours?"

37. "Well, up to a certain poi up to a certain point, I mean, we're supposed to be, I mean we're supposed to be pretty responsible. We're supposed to be pretty mature. We're supposed to be able to take care of ourselves. I mean, if the University's just gonna go right down along the line and fix your stuff and tell you what to do, you're not gonna learn too much."

38. "Set up by the parents?" (Referring to an assertion that most Freshmen women have hours at home)

39. "Do you agree that parents should set them? I mean, you have hours set at home, or may maybe the parents shouldn't be able to set the hours."

40. "I think it would hurt both boys and the girls if they didn't have hours, if they didn't have hours because the boys would be with the girls. You know, take Freshmen boys, and then they'd be out longer than they would normally. I think the Freshman year is a crisis year."

41. "May I ask, when we were talking about, uh, no hours, did you mean all week, all the time, or just on weekends?"

42. "Yah, when you were talking about this, uh." (Interrupted at this point. This refers to abolishing women's hours)

43. "So what have we decided? Have we decided that Juniors and Seniors exempted, right? Automatically. And Sophomores exempted automatically?"

44. "So, Sophomores with parental approval?" (Asking for an indication of others concerning exemption of Sophomores from the present policy)

45. "Cause I think that if they've proved to their parents that they know what they are doing, I think then." (Interrupted at this point. They refers to Sophomores)

46. "Let's adopt number two."

47. "These rules probably apply to number two and three. I mean, most of the girls would be back by 1 anyway, I believe. I mean, wouldn't most girls be back by 1 or 12 if they?" (Interrupted at this point)

48. "I think for the first semester Freshmen girls should have hours."

49. "You don't think they should go a full year? I mean, you could fall pretty quick." (Referring to the time period when hours for Freshmen should be enforced)

50. "I think weekni weeknights we should have them because, uh, that one point that was brought up, coming in coming in late, about 3 A.M., and waking up your roommate." (Interrupted at this point)

51. "Let me start. Well, uh, I think there are some disadvantages to the present policy. I think, uh, the University has a little bit too much control over the girls. I think it's right for them to have, uh, rules for Freshmen, I think, cause coming from high school, and knowing Freshmen boys, they would stay out all night if they didn't have, uh, rules, but, uh, I think that any girl that is 21, well, most of them want to live in an apartment, and, uh, I think girls 21 should be able to stay come in without any parents' permission, but I do think they should allow Freshmen to have hours if their parents, I mean, Sophomores too. Uh, uh, I don't know, the curfew is depends, and it's completely too much control."

52. "Oh, is it? Yah, I know. Well, I don't." Responding to a comment that anyone over 21 is exempted from the rules concerning hours)

53. "Yah, I think it should be just Freshmen." (Referring to the students who should have hours)

54. "No. Well, just weekends." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant wants hours extended on weeknights)

55. "No hours at all?" (Responding to a comment that all women except Freshmen should be exempted from the present policy)

56. "Well, sure they run around, but they won't be here very long if they run around if they keep it up, and I think most kids know that."

57. "Well, I think Freshmen should have hours."

58. "How do girls run around?"

59. "How many girls compare the hours for girls to the no hours for the boys? I mean, I mean, boys don't have any hours. The question is why should girls?"

60. "I think Juniors with Juniors with approval until 21." (Referring to who should be exempted from the present policy)

61. "Well, how old is a Junior? Nineteen or twenty or so?"

62. "No, I think that's right. We should, uh, you know, control the Freshmen cause I think they're trying to get their feet on the ground, and while they're doing that, I." (Interrupted at this point)

63. "Boys can't get in trouble." (Responding to a question concerning why boys do not have hours)

64. "That might be a different story then, but I've got, if a kid goes to college, he should be very serious minded and wanta study, and

I think he should be in." (Responding to a question about what would happen if girls did not have hours)

65. "Well, actually the Freshmen, I think, should have hours, and then by the time they're Sophomores, they're they should be pretty well adjusted and know what's happening, and their parents should know them well enough that by the time they're Sophomores, they should be able to receive parent parental approval if they want to abolish their hours cause the parents know the students better than the University."

66. "Yah, I know it." (Responding to a comment that students change during their Sophomore year)

67. "You get some tyrant in as house president. 'All right, everybody's in at 8 o'clock'." (Commenting on the efficacy of allowing each housing unit to set its own hours)

68. "I think they should keep hours." (Responding to a question concerning the abolition of hours)

69. "That's true, they are." (Responding to a statement that because of hours women are discriminated against)

70. "I think that at home I I know, like the girls have hours, and so I think it should be the same here. I'd say when they're Sophomores and Juniors if their parents give them permission, well, at home it would be the same way. I think by the time they're 21, they should be able to set their own hours."

71. "They have hours." (Responding to a question about the present policy for Sophomores)

72. "For one thing, we think that Freshmen should have hours, you know." (Responding to a question concerning what policy the group should adopt)

73. "Yah, I think it it's true of a lot of students. They show maturity in high school, and then their parents will say, 'Sure, give them the hours, so they'll get to school or get off their feet, or whatever,' you know. They could change quite a bit."

74. "Yah." (Responding to a comment that exempting Freshmen with parental approval would be an acceptable policy if parents could always make responsible decisions)

75. "Except Freshmen have hours like a fraternity, so if they're Freshmen." (Interrupted at this point)

76. "Does everybody agree about Juniors and Seniors being exempted?"

77. "That's a good point. That's what we're here for is to study and make the grades. If you can make the grades, you've gotta have a little

fun." (That refers to abolishing hours for students with good grades)

78. "No, just the Freshmen." (Answering a question concerning whether or not the discussant's proposal to use grade point as a criterion for exemption from the present policy would include upperclassmen)

79. "What about parental approval without grades?" (Directed to a discussant advocating that Freshmen maintaining a certain grade point be exempted with parental approval)

80. "First semester though they would have to be under the policy of hours for women because they wouldn't have any grades."

81. "Or if they overcame the midterm D slips, or whatever they call them, then they might be exempted with parental approval." (Referring to Freshmen)

82. "What if you can't remember?" (Responding to a question about which of the alternative policies the discussants had supported on a pretest several days before the discussion)

83. "I've changed it too now." (Referring to the alternative which the discussant had supported initially)

84. "I think Sophomores, I agree with number two up to the point where I think that Sophomores should have parental approval. Just like like your Freshman year, you should be able to judge for yourself and figure out what hours you should keep."

85. "I think that Freshmen that have a certain grade point and have parental approval, they should be able to do what they want to, stay out as late as they want to because, evidently, they're getting the job done."

86. "I don't know." (Responding to a question about why the University has hours)

87. "Yes, but I think most girls, Freshmen girls, like 18 or 19, at home would have hours. I don't know, my parents." (Interrupted at this point)

88. "By parents at home. I have hours when I'm home. I think most girls do if the parents don't allow the girls to run around. I think, I think Freshmen should have hours when they come here."

89. "I don't think it hurts anything for the Freshmen who have hours."

90. "That's right. Boys' hours are set by, say, girls' hours, wouldn't you agree?"

91. "You mean this fourth one?" (Responding to a question concerning what the discussant meant when he was earlier talking about no hours)

92. "I think I probably meant weekends." (Referring to the time when the discussant feels that hours should not be enforced)

93. "If they're, uh, mature and responsible and everything, and, you know, if they can sit down and talk to their parents, and their parents give their approval. If they believe that, the parents will know. I mean, you can't can't fool yourself, and say, 'Well, I, you know, I'm responsible, and so I can go out every night.'" (Referring to Sophomores)

94. "I think we should stick to number two."

95. "Their parents will know. Like their parents will know better than anybody, cause if they feel that way, they'll do it, but they won't go study. If they believe them, if they know that, they'll give them approval, I'm sure." (Referring to Sophomores)

96. "What about Freshmen?" (Responding to a call for the adoption of alternative two)

97. "No they don't." (Commenting on a statement that most girls without hours return to the dorm at the same time as girls with hours)

98. "They have to adjust, you know. They get pretty tired." (Referring to Freshmen)

99. "Yah, but if you don't have the grade point by the when you're a sophomore, then you have to have parental approval or something. Kinda go on a trial period for your second semester your Freshman year. You're gonna prove yourself then."

100. "I don't think it would disturb the whole dorm. I mean." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to students' disturbing roommates by coming in late)

Non-consensus Group on Women's Hours

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy on hours for undergraduate women?"

1. "There are so many things that Freshmen are worrying about though when they're when they first come to college, and I know if I didn't have hours, I mean there's a lot of girls, if they didn't have hours, they wouldn't get anything done."

2. "Tell me. Name one place. Where would you go every night of the week that'd really ruin your study?"

3. "And it gets out at 10 after 12, so you'd be home by 12:30." (Referring to the Union movies)

4. "It isn't the same for boys." (Referring to decisions about how to spend time when no hours are in force)

5. "Some people aren't as responsible."

6. "All right, then, don't worry about them if they don't" (Referring to people who don't come in at a sensible hour)

7. "Can't they worry about themselves?" (Referring to people who don't come in at a sensible hour)

8. "And for that purpose the rest of us have to suffer." (Referring to people who don't come in at a sensible hour)

9. "Like you said, there's a lot of kids that aren't responsible."

10. "Well, all right, if we're here for an education, why should we bother to have to worry about trivial little rules? If we're here for an education, let's get an education and not have to come in at 12:10. There's a lot more to an education than going to class."

11. "I mean, the library stays open. There are a million things that you might have to do." (Referring to the period from 12 A.M. on)

12. "Well, I think it's good discipline to have to come in earlier."

13. "What if you are busy all day long with other things, important things, that you just can't get done?" (In reaction to a comment that students should be able to complete their work during the day)

14. "Yah, they aren't responsible enough to do it before hand. See. Right." (In response to a comment that some students delay working on term papers until the last day)

15. "Well, I think you're in the minority. I really do." (Referring to going to the library after 12 o'clock)

16. "You shouldn't even have to have that responsibility. I mean, you you should be told the right time, and then, like till you're 21, and then you have a chance to make a decision for yourself."

17. "Well mine certainly is, and I think everyone else's is." (Referring to whether or not one's mind is different at 18 from what it will be when he is 21)

18. "Not the black and white won't change, but, uh, like something could be, uh, you know, a little bit wrong maybe that you wouldn't think of doing now but later on just keeps working toward."

19. "Yah, yah, drinking for one thing." (Offering as an example of something which students view differently between the ages of 18 and 21)

20. "Well, not really. You have degrees. Like if you just drink a little bit, there isn't anything wrong yet, but but, you know, if it's building up and building up." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not students' favorable attitudes toward drinking are wrong)

21. "Yah, but that doesn't make any difference. You didn't think it was any more wrong." (Referring to a discussant who claimed that two years ago that he might have had a different attitude toward drinking than he now has)

22. "Well, I mean, I I can't think of anything that I would consider that much more wrong three years from now than I wouldn't right now. It wouldn't make any difference. I mean, if you've thought about it, if you've lived, if you've done anything, if you've watched people, you should by now have at least come to some conclusions about something, and I mean."

23. "Should we try to list the disadvantages or or what you think the disadvantage are?" (Referring to the present policy)

24. "What if you girls didn't have hours, you know, at home more or less? Kind of a shock for some of you, isn't it?"

25. "Why learn it the hard way when you can learn it the easy way?" (Referring to responsibility)

26. "It's a good excuse, for one thing, to say you have to be in at 1 o'clock if you don't want to stay out any later."

27. "You shouldn't have been out with him in the first place. I mean, if you've gotta use that for an excuse, you've gotta find something else later on. All right, so two years from now, you're going to be more adequate to handle the situation? What are you going to do, you know, two years from now? Because, I mean, 'Well, I think I'd better be home; I know I don't have hours, but, you know, I did two years ago, and that's what counts.'"

28. "I do. I definitely do." (Responding to a comment by another discussant that he did not think that Freshmen should have hours)

29. "Why do we have laws if we don't have re need restrictions? Why is there any such thing as laws? We don't need any laws if we don't need any restrictions."

30. "All right, look, on February 2, when I'm 20 and that midnight of the 21 I am going to be, you know, all of a sudden lightning flashes, the sky opens up, God says, 'You are ready, my dear; you are ready to stay out any time you want; you can drink; you can do anything you want; now, aren't you excited; don't you feel a whole lot smarter?' That's ridiculous. I mean, you know, when you're 21, just because the law says, all right, not I can handle a lot of things probably better now."

31. "They can't put a different age for every person, but I think this arbitrary age is seems to be more right for more people, so that it shows, if you've been shown the right, then, if if you, uh, most people will be more ready then." (Referring to the present policy)

32. "Isn't, uh, the time when we're, uh, boys and girls are out after midnight, usually they're together, right? But the girls have hours, and so they usually go in."

33. "Hours are just put on people who who don't know how to control their morals, aren't they?"

34. "Yah, well, they can find out later, but they need a little guidance now." (Referring to control of moral behavior)

35. "All right, not about the matter at hand, about the staying out. Two years from now, you gonna say, 'Oh, God, am I glad they made me stay in; I would be such a mess by now, such a mess.' I mean, that's insane."

36. "Well, if they don't wanta put any restriction us. We have to have some restrictions put on us, and then, uh, the University feels these are the restrictions."

37. "This probably isn't the University's idea. It's probably the little old ladies in church that say, 'Oh, yah, they have to be in.'" (Interrupted at this point)

38. "Why would you leave it until the last thing at night?" (Referring to such things as working on term papers and going to movies)

39. "Girls' hours are only until you are Sophomores?"

40. "Well, if they are ready to make their decisions, why does somebody else always picks up after them and looks after them?" (Referring to Freshmen)

41. "You are really suffering from coming in at that time?"

42. "Let's take a vote. Who's for it, and who's against it?" (Referring to the present system)

43. "Do you think that we're saying that the hours will automatically make you a better person? That's not true, but it's going to give you time to think about it and make the right decisions." (Interrupted at this point)

44. "So you're worrying about everybody else." (Responding to a comment by another discussant that his upbringing has been proper)

45. "But you wouldn't come in even if you didn't have restrictions?"

46. "Oh, that's a wonderful idea. I think we should have more restrictions. I think we should have to be in at 6 in the morning, you know. Be out from like 5 to 6. That's the only time we can get out at all."

47. "By breaking the rules, they're ruining themselves." (Referring to girls who stay out all night)

48. "Well, anyway, if these things are gonna go on at all, they could be going on just as well before 1 o'clock as after."

49. "Everything's going on until like 12 or 1, and after that, there's nothing going on. Nothing to do."

50. "All right, so what? If they're enjoying it, if they feel it is right for them, they, I don't think anybody could do anything about it." (Referring to what people who stay out late do)

51. "Where would you go? (Referring to where girls would go if they had no hours)

52. "I don't know. I'd probably just goof off." (Responding to a question about what the discussant would do were women's hours to be abolished)

53. "Okay, uh, well, I could, I don't know, it's just my personal opinion." (Referring to the need for women's hours)

54. "Why isn't it the same for boys? You don't consider yourself as responsible as the boys? (Referring to decisions about how to spend time when no hours are in force)

55. "Are you? Do you consider yourself? I mean, don't worry about anybody else if they can't handle it. I mean." (Referring to responsibility)

56. "Somebody's gotta worry about them." (Referring to people who don't come in at a sensible hour)

57. "Until they're 21, I think they should have, uh, somebody there telling them what to do." (Referring to girls)

58. "Are you really suffering because you have to come in at 1 o'clock?"

59. "Then they shouldn't be here." (Referring to irresponsible students)

60. "The library stays open until 2 o'clock, and if you have to do a term paper." (Interrupted at this point)

61. "How many people would go to the library?" (Responding to a statement that people would use their time productively if hours were abolished)

62. "Well, shouldn't you be able to do that yourself?" (Referring to the discipline which another discussant has stated hours provide)

63. "You have class until 4:30, and it takes your more than, maybe 6 hours to write a term paper." (Referring to the need for later hours)

64. "And anyway, this example of the library is a very small part of it. How many people would go the library after 12 o'clock?"

65. "All right, if you were going to study, you, the fact that you could. I mean, where else could you go. I mean, there are a lot of things that you could do." (Referring to the students' use of time if the present policy were changed)

66. "Until you're 21? My mind is no different right now than it will be when I'm 21." (Responding to a comment that girls should be told when to come in until they are 21)

67. "I don't think so." (Commenting on the question of whether or not one's mind changes between the ages of 18 and 21)

68. "I could, an example?" (Asking for an example of something which students view differently between the ages of 18 and 21)

69. "And that's wrong? I mean." (Referring to students' changing attitudes toward drinking)

70. "Well, I don't think that's, you know, like I don't consider drinking a sin, or you know."

71. "No, not two years ago." (Referring to the fact that his attitude toward drinking has not changed for two years)

72. "I don't think everybody's decided on all this now. I think there's a lot of things I don't have any, and that's why you need the discipline and guidance." (Referring to changes in outlook between the ages of 18 and 21)

73. "Well, I think the disadvantages are, I mean, if there's anything that you really have to legitimately do, you can't do it. I mean, I just don't like to have any pressure at all. You spend half of your life in a place, you know, that is supposed to prepare you for life, and it's under such adverse conditions that it is nothing like real life at all. I mean, in my real life I will never have to come in at any time. I mean, if I wanta, and, I mean, so when I'm 21, that makes me much better to come in, you know, at any time I want. I can come in at 3 in the morning then. I can't now though."

74. "Well, right. I mean, I didn't have that much, you know, who cares? She didn't. You know, that she, 'You got in late last night, didn't you?' Well, you know, she knew what I was doing, so so what?" (Referring to hours at home)

75. "How are you learning it the easy way? By having to stay in? I mean, are you really learning something? Do you feel better off, feel more at ease? It makes you comfortable to know that you have to be in by 12 o'clock and at 1 o'clock on weekends?"

76. "Can't you just say, 'I don't want to be out any longer. Please take me home.'?" (Commenting on a statement that hours provide good excuses to get away from poor dates)

77. "Two years from now we will be, we can make our, more decisions easier, I think, generally. I think, I really think that Freshmen are very unstable. They don't know what's going on. They are so mixed up at this stage."

78. "Well, I don't. I think it's ridiculous that people should have to have restrictions. I mean, how can you grow as an individual if you're always having?" (Interrupted at this point)

79. "You're right. There should be a bare minimum of laws."

80. "Wait a minute. It isn't gonna open up all at once. It's just that gradually as time goes on, you're gonna be more ready at that stage of your life to accept things for yourself and make decisions, the right decisions."

81. "All right, at our particular college, where we are now, we are not ready right now to stay out. At some other colleges, now the boys are."

82. "All right, so why can't it be the other way around? Why can't the boys have to stay in and the girls be out? Would that really, you know, shift things? Would that?" (Interrupted at this point)

83. "Right, and too many people don't." (Referring to controlling one's moral behavior)

84. "That's not gonna make any difference. They've done it 17, 18 years. They'll still do it." (Referring to the efficacy of hours in controlling moral behavior)

85. "No, you just wouldn't get tired. You wouldn't wanta go to bed." (Referring to what would happen if women had no hours)

86. "Well, you don't. All right, about this matter here. You don't have to go in, and are you really a rotten, morally, unmoral person?"

87. "The religious bodies. Put one in for me, boy. That's really ridiculous. The mere fact that we have to be in. All right, what if we have a term paper due? What if we wanta watch a show or something?"

88. "Because you are busy during the day. Besides, I do not function until 12 at noon. I can stay up until 5 in the morning, but." (Interrupted at this point)

89. "No, you have Juniors and Seniors with no hours, but still you have to sign out and do all kinds of weird things."

90. "All right, now, when we're out of college, and you think until the time they're 21, these immature people that you see running around, that you you're watching out for, that you're suffering for right now, that you've gotta come in for." (Interrupted at this point)

91. "Well, I mean, not, you know, physically exhausted, but, I mean, you know, I just don't like to have to do anything I don't want to that's stupid like that." (Responding to a question about suffering as a result of having to observe hours)

92. "I think we've got 4 against 2. (Responding to a call for a vote on the question)

93. "Haven't you had time to think about it?" (Responding to a comment that hours give women time to think about how they will conduct themselves in later life)

94. "Not necessarily, I think it's a good idea for all of us. I really do." (Responding to a question about whether or not the discussant feels that he should be excluded from the restriction of hours)

95. "Yes, I would." (Referring to coming in even if restrictions were removed)

96. "Everybody has to have some restrictions on him."

97. "How? How are they ruining themselves? They're probably having a good time." (Referring to girls who stay out all night)

98. "Girls can get married at 18 if they." (Interrupted at this point)

99. "Posh! Rip all the roofs off the houses in Iowa City, and I bet I could find plenty going on." (Responding to a comment that there is nothing to do after 12 o'clock)

100. "What would this society be like if everybody made their own rules about decisions like that?" (Referring to what people who stay out late do)

Consensus Group on Students' Possession of Automobiles

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?"

1. "Well, are we going to follow this discussion agenda thing? (Referring to the agenda attached to the discussants' instruction sheets)

2. "I think the parking problem would be a disadvantage too because there's a parking problem now. If Freshmen and Sophomores were driving cars, it would be even worse."

3. "I don't think there's any reason for girls to a have a car really down here. I mean it's not so important." (Interrupted at this point)

4. "That's right. Another thing I've noticed is most of your students who have a three point or above average aren't, around here, going out that much. They don't have the time. (Referring to exempting Sophomores with a 3.0 grade point average from the present policy)

5. "Well, yah, but most are Sophomores, and they can't live in unapproved housing, and that's all unapproved. Well, I don't know about Mayflower, but Lakeside's not approved." (Referring to private housing areas on the outskirts of Iowa City)

6. "No it isn't." (Responding to a comment that Lakeside Apartments is approved housing)

7. "I think actually it should be limited to the person who needs the car." (Referring to a policy on students' possession of automobiles on campus)

8. "I think in a case like that they should be allowed to have a car, especially if they're married." (Referring to students who live in University housing on the outskirts of town)

9. "If they're Freshmen and Sophomores, they're limited they're restricted right away. I mean, I'm sure that you all can appeal to President Bowen. You'll probably get caught, but again it sorta depends on what the student what his needs are. I think that it also depends on where he's living off-campus because some of these places I don't think are really that far away. The Mayflower is far away too, but." (Interrupted at this point)

10. "Of course, there's there's the advantage you don't have to pay for parking meters, you don't have to pay for traffic fines that you can get, you don't have to worry about accidents, you don't have to worry about insurance, you don't have to worry about registration, you don't have to worry about." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to riding the bus)

11. "Well, if I was living out at Mayflower, and, you know, I got done with a class, and the bus has just left five minutes, well, what the heck, you've gotta stand around for 55 minutes waiting for your stupid bus to come back so you can go back to your." (Interrupted at this point)

12. "Here again, it sort of depends upon the situation, that is." (Referring to how far a student will have to park his car from a class which he is attending)

13. "Oh, uh, what what is the registration for? I don't get that part. Do they all have to?" (Interrupted at this point)

14. "Right. And then when you're a Junior and a Senior, then you can get a reserved or a restricted one." (Referring to parking stickers)

15. "Darn right. It has to be. If you're driving a car on campus, anywhere on campus, it has to be registered." (Responding to a question asking the discussant if his car is registered even though he is an Iowa City resident)

16. "They can catch you and put a fine on you if they catch you driving around." (Directed to a discussant who lives in town but has not registered his car with the University)

17. "No, not if you live in town." (Denying that Iowa City residents attending the University can be fined for not registering their cars)

18. "Well, that's ridiculous, this this registering a car."

19. "Erase everything. Let's go on to number three, broadening the present policy, actually we have, allowing all undergraduate students to have cars on campus without having to register them. You do something with, I don't know." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to one of the alternatives suggested on the discussants' instruction sheets)

20. "Well, I I don't see why that should be in there, besides the fact that, you know, that, uh." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to registration of students' automobiles)

21. "It's kinda so they can tell how many cars will be on campus at a certain time." (Referring to automobile registration)

22. "Frankly, we shot four saying that they should be registered." (Referring to the fourth alternative on the instruction sheets)

23. "Let's go back to, uh, mentioning the fact of having permits for people who need it. We only said that it was hard to determine that, but now in your case, it would be fairly obvious." (Referring to a discussant who said he lives in Coralville and works every afternoon)

24. "Yah, but if you're gonna say that he's allowed to get a permit, then it's gonna be so hard to distinguish because all underclassmen should be allowed to get a permit if they can come up with some kind of an excuse."

25. "It doesn't matter to me, I mean, because I get away cheaper parking now than I do if I pay the $40. Is it 40 a semester or 40 a year?"

26. "Yah, but they only need it if they change the rule. Does does the rule need changing? Now that's what you have to determine." (Referring to additional parking space)

27. "That would be just about it. It it would be a luxury, and not a necessity." (Referring to a car)

28. "What do you think we should do?" (Directed to an individual, not the group)

29. "How about having a rental service? Like somebody in town." (Interrupted at this point)

30. "In this traffic it'd be ridiculous." (Commenting on a car rental service)

31. "Well, like I have a car, and the only time I I ever use it is on the weekends. That's that's the only time I I ever it it sits beside my house the whole time, and I I walk to all my classes, and I walk to the field house, and I walk back home and that, because I just don't wanta, I, like I could get away with it, but, what the heck, you know, you can always even beat the cops around here parking. You know, like they have over at the field house, you can always park out there like you're going to visit the hospital. All you have to do is wait until the cop goes by and sneak in there and and hide. When he goes by again, you go in the field house, and they'll never know if you're in the hospital or in the field house."

32. "It really has no, uh, no weight cause the person either won't need the car or, uh, what else did we say?" (Referring to grade point as a criterion for exemption from the present policy)

33. "It'd it'd take more than one parking ramp. You can't you can't you can't visualize how many how much more." (Interrupted at this point)

34. "Well, yah, if they're not gonna drive, what do they need a car for?"

35. "Okay, in that case, rent a garage in town. You don't have to register with the with the campus if you're not driving it on campus." (Responding to a comment that students need cars to go home on weekends)

36. "There's there's a garage across from our alley that the people rent out, and it's $27 a month for two college students for two parking places."

37. "What's wrong with going home every weekend?"

38. "I could imagine, I can imagine, you know, how it feels all right to go home, you know, as often as you can and how like if you're stuck here, like like a kid in my swimming class is stuck here until Christmas. He's been here only because he lives in New York, and the only time he can go back is Christmas, and then after that, it will be the last time until, you know, the end of the year."

39. "You you can rent an apartment and have it approved by housing University housing cause cause, you know, like like where I live, it's about eight blocks from campus, and a lot a lot of the people around there are just old couples, you know, and have big houses, and they rent out their rooms upstairs to students, and they those are that's are approved housing."

40. "I don't know, but just just when I think of it, I think, you know, of allowing anymore people to have cars, you know, I I just can't believe, of all the places, you know, that the students are all the time, like there's always a lot of them at the field house, there's always a lot of people at the library, or over at the Union, and and they're at the dorms, you know. You you just think where in the heck are you gonna put all those cars? Just where are you gonna put them? Drive them up on the grass and everything like that? I I just can't visualize it."

41. "The streets here, we'll just have to admit the streets in this town are not made for, uh, large amounts of traffic. They're just not. Take some of the streets that the only way you can go is right or left. Well, uh, like this one out here, the main intersection, one of the only few streets that comes across the river, you go right or left. You get to another corner, and you have to go right or left, or else you just fall into the river, and you go on out of town. It wasn't planned to handle heavy traffic."

42. "Have you ever been to Los Angeles?" (Responding to a comment that if Los Angeles can handle its parking problem, Iowa City should be able to also)

43. "Yah, but see, like the town of Cedar Rapids is like their population doesn't fluctuate like this does. What the heck. like here, Iowa City in one month, like say in August, you know, the population is not too much. Now, all of a sudden, in September there's 20,000 more people in town all of a sudden, and if if those 20,000 people brought cars, there's 10,000 more cars. What are you gonna do with them?"

44. "Yah, well, where's the money for all these parking ramps gonna come from? Probably out of the tax pocket."

45. "Well, if, well, I'll tell you. Like if I lived in Quad or Hillcrest, and I had a car, and I was a Freshman or Sophomore, and there was snow on the ground, like there's gonna be, and it was colder than H out, like it's gonna be, and I had to go over to John Wilson's to get, uh, uh, three golf balls for my golf elementary golf course, I sure wouldn't walk. I I'd jump in my car and drive. And so 75 other guys decided that they had to go to Wardway and, uh, the Union, and the chemistry building, and they all decided that they weren't gonna walk in the snow and the cold, and they decided to drive, plus all the people that are regularly driving, all heading for that one intersection." (Interrupted at this point)

46. "And we haven't even discussed discussed the problem of money, where the money's gonna come from for all this." (Referring to parking ramps)

47. "Yah, yah, but it'd be a municipal operated thing, and so that the parking stickers that the students would pay should go to the city, right, instead of the University?"

48. "Your father is gonna is gonna have very little choice on urban renewal anyway. If they decide they're gonna have urban renewal, they just, it makes no difference what your father thinks. If the federal government." (Interrupted at this point)

49. "Well, like if you cut out this parking lot right now and started building a ramp there, where are all these guys gonna park?"

50. "Well, at any rate, we sort of chewed this over and over and over. Somebody draw a conclusion."

51. "I guess we sort of have to. All right, are there any disadvantages? I don't know, I don't think there's anything wrong with it really because as, uh, from what I've been doing around campus, of course, this is isolated, but I have no see no need for a car. Of course, there are a couple of times when I've had to go over to town for just one little item like washing detergent or something, and then when I get back, I found out that I could have bought it right there in the dorm. But outside of a few isolated instances, I don't really see where a Freshman or a Sophomore would need a car. Even on dates, you're just getting to know people down here. You'll know about three or four girls, say, the first year. Maybe you'll go out with three or four. Maybe you'll go out with more than that, but actually, everything is within walking distance, and a car is not really necessary. At least, I don't think it is." (Responding in the first sentence to a question concerning whether or not the group should follow the agenda attached to the instruction sheets)

52. "I also agree with your disadvantage. You also not only have a parking problem, but you'd also have the problem that that, uh, the campus would be so clogged that people that are wanting to drive drive to class and drive from class and everything like that that, like up here where people are trying to get across the intersections, there'd probably be about six accidents there, and, uh." (Interrupted at this point)

53. "Yah, girls can mooch off all the guys." (Responding to a comment that girls don't need cars on campus)

54. "Well, I think there's a lota kids in U University housing, Freshmen and Sophomores, that necessitates having a car cause if you look at some of the people, I don't know if you know where where the new Westside High School is gonna be, but it's out past Finkbine Golf Course out there, you know, and stuff like the Mayflower Hall and Lake Lakeside Apartments. All these people that don't have cars, they have to commute

on this this bus. I think they must come around every hour or something."

55. "No, Lakeside is approved housing." (Responding to a comment that Lakeside Apartments is not approved housing)

56. "Yes it is. I think it is cause there's an advertisement in The Daily Iowan." (Referring to the status of Lakeside Apartments as approved housing)

57. "I don't, yah, but, yah, I mean, how are you gonna determine that? Some guy's some guy's gonna naturally say, well, 'I need a car really bad,' and he's really not going to, so, you know, what the heck, they're sure gonna be real truthful about it." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that the policy on students' possession of automobiles should be limited to those who actually need a car)

58. "You mean they can't have cars if they live clear out there?" (Referring to University housing on the outskirts of town)

59. "Well, like they have that bus run, but I'm I I don't really know how that operates, but I know I wouldn't." (Interrupted at this point)

60. "You have to worry about accidents still. Have you ever seen those buses zoom down the street?" (Responding to a comment that riding in a bus, one is free from certain worries)

61. "Yah, but you'd have to walk about for ten minutes to find your car." (Responding to a comment about the disadvantages of riding a bus)

62. "And the time of day." (Adding to a comment that how far one must park his car from class depends on the situation)

63. "Well, registration is is when they're like a Junior or Senior, you know, that's gonna have a car on the campus, and he has to register it with the University, and they give him a parking sticker. I don't know how much it costs. Something like $40." (Responding to a question concerning what is meant by registration)

64. "Well, like since you live in town, is your car registered with the University?"

65. "Well, I don't even know if mine's registered."

66. "Even if he lives right in town here?" (Referring to fining local residents attending the University but who fail to register their cars)

67. "Yes." (Reaffirming an earlier statement that Iowa City residents attending the University can be fined for not registering their cars)

68. "Especially, if you live in the town. I mean, it's like me living

in Cedar Rapids, and I have to register with Coe College because I go around it every time I." (Interrupted at this point. Adding to a statement that automobile registration is ridiculous)

69. "I don't know, I think they should be registered. If you're a student and have a car, you should register it."

70. "Well, actually, it's more of a convenience for you than it is for anybody else because if your car has a like 62 license plate on it, and you're parking it in the University parking area, there's no registration on it or sticker or anything, you'll probably get a nice juicy ticket for it, but if it is registered, even though a trade, then it won't they won't, you know, they'll have, uh, at least, I think they would, as you were saying here, they let you park it in the lot just to get your uniform, or if you probably wouldn't have had that registration, they would have." (Interrupted at this point)

71. "Well, I think it'd probably also be the idea that, uh, that they can tell like if there's cars stolen and that kind of stuff." (Referring to automobile registration)

72. "So, there really aren't any disadvantages to the present policy then, or are there?"

73. "Is it though? Then why don't I have a permit?" (Responding to a comment that in the case of the present discussant, the need for a permit to have a car is obvious)

74. "Well, if they can prove they're working and that their work is away from campus. I mean, somebody from New York that says, 'I'm I'm working. Well, where are you working? Well, there's this delicatessen down on 44th Street.'" (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that if exceptions are made for some students, anyone can find an excuse for having a car)

75. "I think it's 40 a year." (Responding to a comment concerning the parking fee at the University)

76. "We're actually agreed then that o the only people who really need cars are the ones who live off-campus in University approved housing, or maybe not University approved housing, and have to commute, and it'd take some it would take them too long to get here if they were walking, or this type of thing, but the actual student on campus, as we said before, really wouldn't need it because of the fact that everything is sort of centrally located and that if you have to buy something, it's your special little privilege to remember to do that when you're over here. If you don't, you come back on your own time, and it's your fault."

77. "I I I mean, living here, I just can't imagine, you know, having having many more cars than are already here. I I just can't imagine like like you go on these streets around campus, and there's cars parked

on both sides and cars trying trying to go through both ways, and I." (Interrupted at this point)

78. "I think we need the parking ramp now. I mean, before, we wanted all those underclassmen to drive." (Responding to a question concerning what the discussant thinks should be done)

79. "No, that's ridiculous because even even like like down here at the Honda Rental, they had it, but the University students went down there, and the Hondas were so wrecked up and beated up, and that's I think that's out of the question." (Referring to the establishment of a car rental service)

80. "It's so expensive, anyway, that the average student couldn't afford it." (Referring to a car rental service)

81. "You're wrong there. They'd go and check. They'll put a ticket on it." (Responding to a comment that students can fool the police by pretending they are visiting the hospital when they really intend to go to the field house)

82. "Taking easy subjects so you could get a car." (Adding to a comment concerning reasons for not using grade point average as a criterion for exemption from the present policy)

83. "Well, you're around here during the summer. You know how bad it is." (Referring to the parking problem)

84. "To get home on the weekends." (Responding to a question concerning why underclassmen need cars on campus if they are not going to drive them)

85. "A garage in town you could rent would be about $8 a month."

86. "Well, if if a car's that much of a necessity, if you go home every weekend, you're gonna have to do something to have it. Do you think we should change the policy then just for those students who wanta go home every weekend and see Mommy and Daddy?"

87. "Nothing's wrong with it, but, uh." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a question concerning what is wrong with going home every weekend)

88. "But would a car be that much of a convenience? You can imagine how much it would cost." (Referring to trips to New York by car for Iowa students who live there)

89. " Some of them are, right, but it's tough, tough to get it approved." (Referring to apartments off-campus in town people's homes which another discussant has said are approved by the University)

90. "What is it like down here in the summer? I'm in Cedar Rapids, so I'm never down here. It's sort of dead, isn't it?"

91. "You're just thinking of the problem at places like Madison where that's true." (Responding to a comment concerning the inadequacy of Iowa City streets to handle heavy traffic)

92. "Yes, several times. They have no parking problem at all." (Responding to a question asking the discussant if he has ever been to Los Angeles)

93. "I don't know, but like in Cedar Rapids they have Coe and that, but, you know. (interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that because of the University, Iowa City's population fluctuates more than Cedar Rapids')

94. "Let's speculate. What do you what do you think would happen if, let's say that 600 more kids were allowed to get care? What what do you think would happen those first couple of weeks? Do you think they might drive them?" (Interrupted at this point)

95. "It wouldn't work." (Responding to a comment about what would happen on a cold day if a large number of people, all having cars, went out at the same time and met at the same intersection)

96. "It would probably be increased fees, yah, fees for your car." (Referring to how money for parking ramps to be built in the future would be collected)

97. "There would be a need for a parking sticker." (Referring to a municipally owned and operated parking area)

98. "Yah, but my father is one of the 'they' that decide too." (Responding to a comment that the discussant's father will have very little to say about urban renewal in Iowa City)

99. "You could build the ramp off to the side." (Responding to a question about what would happen to the parking problem if ramps were built over existing parking areas)

100. "Yah, but they didn't say very much." (Responding to a call by another discussant for someone in the discussion to draw a conclusion)

Non-consensus Group on Students' Possession of Automobiles

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy concerning undergraduates' possession of automobiles on campus?"

1. "Well, I don't I don't think I really understand the policy right now. You can have cars as long as you don't park them in University places, right?"

2. "Well, I know a Sophomore that does have a car." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that underclassmen are not allowed to have cars on campus)

3. "Well, then they can they can have it, right? But they if they're not living in University housing, they can't have one? Is that it?" (Referring to underclassmen's possession of cars on campus)

4. "Well, then they ca can't have a parking area if they're Freshmen or Sophomores, can they?"

5. "Yah, if you're commuting, I think. That's it. The commuters have those Freshmen stickers."

6. "So, then, regular Freshmen, I don't know, I think we're all set, we we can't have, we're living in, you know, on campus. We can't have cars as Freshmen. We can have them, but we can't register them."

7. "We usually find some guy to drive down from the house to the class, but it takes him so long to find a parking place, we could walk."

8. "There's a disadvantage with motorcycles also. Motorcycles can be registered. Uh, anyone up here can have a motorcycle, no matter regardless of their classification as to year, but you can only park in motorcycle parking lots. You can't park in any of the commuter parking spaces."

9. "Well, I think one of the worst things is the idea that if you do have a car and park it someplace where you're not supposed to, they fine you $25 automatically. That's ridiculous, $25 for a parking ticket."

10. "I mean, I can I can see regulating the policy, yah, but $25, isn't that kind of expensive? And the $40 for the second offense. I mean, you know, maybe $5-$10, it'd be enough to get your point across, but $25 is ridiculous."

11. "Yah, but it's so easy to keep from breaking them, the law." (Referring to parking regulations)

12. "I don't think they should be restricted, but I think there's some restriction necessary. I don't think that necessarily Freshmen and Sophomores should be because they haven't been here before. I think they really have as much right, but I think there is some need for restriction." (Referring to possession of cars)

13. "But why don't you have a car up here? Because you can't. They don't allow you to because you haven't been here before. (Responding to a comment that the University restricts possession of automobiles, not because underclassmen are new to the University, but because of the parking problem)

14. "I I realize that, but I don't think they should necessarily choose Freshmen and Sophomores." (Referring to a shortage of parking facilities)

15. "Seniority, but I don't think that's necessarily the right criteria." (Referring to a criterion for determining who should be allowed to have cars on campus)

16. "Well, for example, though, Freshmen and Sophomores are at a disadvantage even when you go to get a basketball ticket."

17. "They have to draw a line someplace." (Responding to a comment that Freshmen are at a disadvantage)

18. "Well, would it be so impossible for Freshmen to have cars here if they did make certain changes?" (Referring to the Administration)

19. "Yah, I'm not talking about using the car here on campus. I think that's ridiculous."

20. "They'll have to build a lot lot of parking ramps, won't they? Because, you know, if they're gonna let Freshmen and Sophomores have cars, even if just to take home with them, they're gonna practically all have it, and it's gonna triple the amount of cars that are here now. There's a lota kids that that like because you can get a car." (Interrupted at this point)

21. "It's not that many. I'd say less than 40 percent of all Freshmen boys have cars."

22. "You mean own cars and have them here? (Responding to a comment that less than 40 percent of all Freshmen boys have cars)

23. "It's a little expensive to store a car when there's no room too."

24. "Well, there's the one, I think there's one south of, about three or four blocks south of Hillcrest." (Referring to a parking area)

25. "The University owns quite a bit of the town. They could tear down a hotel of the town. They've just bought that old hotel over there for not too much." (Responding to a question concerning how the University could provide more parking space)

26. "Well, what would be the possibility of allowing all students to have have cars, but not drive them on campus? I mean, set up a certain boundary around the campus so that no cars could be driven in front of that. Make it stric strictly pedestrian inside that area."

27. "People that live over here and have a class over there are gonna have to drive. They could they you'd have to drive all the way around. Is that what you mean?" (Responding to a suggestion concerning the establishment of a boundary around the campus)

28. "It'd be kinda hard to define. I mean, if you wanted to drive, like you lived in Hillcrest, and you had a class in East Hall, and you had to bypass the middle section, you'd have to drive all the vay around, you know, to Riverside Drive and go way out that way or someplace, but it might be worth it then. It's not a bad idea." (Referring to a boundary around the campus)

29. "That's true, but wou wou would it change in time if they did put a boundary around it? Would it change so that the classrooms got closer together, you know, with new building going on? Make it easier." (Responding to a comment that classes are so far apart that walking between them is impractical)

30. "Granted, if they allow Freshmen and Sophomores to have cars, they will it will make the problem a lot worse. I think it's necessary, not necessary, but I think it would relieve the tension if they allowed Freshmen and Sophomores to have cars."

31. "Well, like I have one here, but I don't use it here in town. It's silly. I can walk places faster, but I use it anytime I wanta leave town. That's why I have it up here." (Referring to a car)

32. "The temperature reached 10 below last year, and I think a car would come in awfully handy then."

33. "Well, what about these visitors' parking lots? Like they, you know, they're never half full or anything." (Referring to possible ways to solve the parking problem)

34. "I mean, to be considered a visitor, you have you can you cannot have any relation down here at all. You can't have a thing to do with University to be considered a visitor."

35. "Do they just restrict parking, uh, you know, where they usually have No Parking zones, do they these, uh, do they restrict those during special weekends like Fathers' Day and all that?

36. "Well, because I know on one weekend, last Thanksgiving, and I went, no it was Homecoming, everybody was parking in No Parking zones, and, you know, nobody was getting tickets for it."

37. "You can't." (Responding to a comment that students may park in one of the faculty parking lots on Friday and Saturday nights)

38. "Yah, for visitors' parking it says that, but, I don't know, we parked there, and we got a $25 ticket, and the." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to a faculty parking lot)

39. "No, the sign was up there. It says, you know, 'Visitors' Parking from'." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that the discussant must have received a ticket for parking in a faculty lot before a sign permitting visitor parking was put up)

40. "It says from so and so Friday night until so and so Sunday night, and we parked in there, and Saturday night they gave us the ticket. $25. That's ridiculous. You know, there's hardly any cars in there."

41. "I think we've got two good ideas. One of them would be, you know, have more places for storage, and the other one, you know, have boundaries around a certain area where people, you know, go pedestrian inside the boundaries. That would solve a lot of problems. It would solve traffic problems, you know, like, uh, like at Burge Hall. And down here in this corner, there's, you never get through, and you've gotta stop about four times before you get through there anyway. If you had, you'd have to have more parking places though. You'd have to have parking place." (Interrupted at this point)

42. "That that would, you'd have more cars, you know, more money coming in, and you could build more parking places with the extra money." (Referring to the results of changing the present policy)

43. "I've sorta been wondering, you know, just how, I think a car for most students is is something nice. I wonder how how many students it's really a necessity. I mean, it's nice to go home, you know, to have a car here to be able to go home, but how necessary is it? I'm sure there's, you know, people that they, you know, the the car's, you know, a necessity, but just, uh, you know, I think we've you've got along without cars, you know, and I know our society is changing. I just wonder, you know, if if the problem is it'd be something that'd be nice to have. Is it really?" (Interrupted at this point)

44. "I went to school for two years without a car, and it was either take the bus or hitchhike."

45. "I really hate to be petty about it, but I do consider a car to, uh, it's a sphere of privacy which is hard to find at the University."

46. "So at this, there are two good ideas that we have, which are very good ideas. One of them, I I don't think you could, you know, really get through here. That'd be boundaries because it it'd be kinda hard, even trucks go down these streets, and, I don't know, maybe you could do it. It wouldn't be a bad idea." (Interrupted at this point)

47. "They could route all trucks around the highway and not through town. That wouldn't be hard at all."

48. "Maybe you you could, I wonder what what would happen if you just excluded students from that area and, you know, let the city people go through." (Referring to the inside of a boundary which the group is considering drawing around the campus)

49. "Would you allow people living in unapproved housing to have cars also, or only in approved, I mean, University housing?"

50. "I think it should be restricted. I don't know how. I think I think I sorta think what they have today because I don't think Freshmen

need cars that bad. The only thing that a Freshman needs a car for is to go home. Well, you can't be sort of spreading out like like I live way over there on Dubuque Street, and I have to go to the field house twice a week."

51. "I guess you can have a car if you keep it in a garage and don't park it in University places."

52. "I know a lot of Freshmen who have cars. They have cars, and they have a certain Freshman sticker, and they just park it in certain places."

53. "It's not registered with the University, however." (Referring to cars of underclassmen)

54. "I guess not." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not underclassmen have parking areas)

55. "Does that go for Sophomores too?" (Responding to a question concerning which Freshmen have parking areas)

56. "Yah, uh, it sort of seems, well, we all have them. It's just that an experience, you know, well, over Thanksgiving time, I tried to find a parking place for a friend of mine's car, and I'm taking it home. I mean, you have to park it a long ways from campus. I mean, it's just that the facilities are taken up, especially over on our side of the river with the University hospitals, field house, and they're just isn't any place to park it."

57. "I think it's a good idea that Freshmen don't have cars because, I mean, you wouldn't be able to find a parking place then, and then you'd be late for class."

58. "There's not very many left." (Referring to parking spaces for motorcycles)

59. "Well, that's one way of assuring that assuring that people will register their cars." (Referring to fines of $25 for unauthorized parking)

60. "Yah, but this is for putting your car in a in a place, maybe the wrong block, which you certainly know what's the right block. It isn't like for parking overtime." (Referring to fines for unauthorized parking by students)

61. "Well, I think we're sort of straying a little bit, so what do you what do you think? Do you think we should, Freshmen and Sophomores should have cars, or do you think we shouldn't?"

62. "Well, I don't think they're doing it just because they haven't been here before. I think it's probably because everybody would like to have a car up here and probably would." (Referring to the policy of restricting automobiles to upperclassmen)

63. "There wouldn't be room if everybody had a car up here."

64. "Well, there's some Juniors and Seniors that they're not gonna have room for either. You know, like maybe transfer students."

65. "Well, what do you think? Do you think grades?" (Interrupted at this point. Referring to criteria for determining which students should be allowed to have cars on campus)

66. "Yah, that's true." (Responding to a comment that underclassmen are at a disadvantage even when they attempt to purchase tickets for basketball games)

67. "Someday maybe you will have the advantage. That way it's equal for everyone." (Referring to the disadvantage of being a Freshman under the present policy)

68. "Like what changes?" (Responding to another question asking whether or not underclassmen could have cars if certain changes were made)

69. "I don't think there's any reason to drive to class unless you live in Coralville or Lakeside or someplace."

70. "But how many, what percentage of Freshmen own cars? I'd say less than 40." (Responding to a comment that if Freshmen could have cars on campus, the present number of cars would triple)

71. "Yah, but I bet they'd, uh, you know, make provisions to have one." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that less than 40 percent of all Freshmen boys have cars)

72. "No, own them" (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant meant that less than 40 percent of the Freshmen boys own cars and have them on campus)

73. "Well, for example, if they do charge, I'm not sure what the fee is." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to registration and parking fees)

74. "Does does, uh, doesn't it cost more to park in the close ones? What, $40?" (Referring to University parking areas)

75. "But I I don't know if the advantages would be worth the expense. So the that way people could drive to class, and they could, the intersection, this intersection out here, there could be more cars, and they could even be Hell for the kids walking to class. Uh, maybe not have kids' cars on campus at all, right?" (Referring to expansion in parking facilities)

76. "Well, the trouble is though we have no campus here." (Responding to a suggestion to get up a boundary around the campus and allow no cars inside)

77. "Well, no, you'd walk to class through the campus.' (Responding to a question concerning how students would get to class if a boundary around the campus were established)

78. "The trouble though is the campus it it was laid out very impractically." (Referring to establishing a boundary around the campus)

79. "Very un very unlikely." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not in the future classroom buildings will be closer together)

80. "Well, they have to do something because there's so many kids that have them now, illegally or whatever it is, that it's the main problem." (Referring to underclassmen's possession of automobiles)

81. "Well, some people live in fraternity houses and that way out like that have cars. And then there's once in a while, maybe the cold night, that you'd like to have a car just to go over to the library or something."

82. "It's usually more work to get in the cold car and get it started to drive over to the place. You fool around with the key in the cold." (Interrupted at this point)

83. "There's a sticker on in on your car, and you can't park there." (Referring to visitors' parking lots)

84. "You mean you can't have a child here?" (Responding to a comment that to be considered a visitor, one cannot be connected with the University in any way)

85. "They've changed it just recently." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not parking regulations are enforced in No Parking zones during special occasions)

86. "You know in that lot over there at that faculty-staff lot between Hillcrest and the Quad you can park there Friday nights and Saturday nights."

87. "It says it's reserved 24 hours a day from Sunday night through Friday night." (Referring to a sign at one of the faculty parking lots)

88. "I wonder if you did it before they changed it. They just put that sign up there, what, four or five weeks ago." (Responding to a discussant who said he received a ticket for parking in a faculty lot)

89. "I'd better be careful. I've got my car in there for the weekend." (Referring to a faculty lot)

90. "So what do we propose to do?"

91. "This might alleviate the problem of allowing students to have cars, additional students, but which students will be allowed to have

cars?" (Referring to two suggestions: increasing storage space and putting a boundary around the campus)

92. "Yah, but I really don't think boundaries would work cause, I mean, it won't, the emphasis is the main street in the big metropolis of Iowa City."

93. "The only reason that I would want it for is to go home on a quick trip because when I go home, I either hitchhike or, you know, find somebody that rides. I can't see it would it would be stupid for a girl to hitchhike. I mean, you can always take a train. I mean." (interrupted at this point)

94. "Did you go to a small school with a defined campus?" (Responding to a comment by another discussant who said that he had gone to another school for two years and was unable to have a car)

95. "Yah, where can you go on Friday nights?" (Responding to a comment that a car is a sphere of privacy that students can't find at the University)

96. "There's nothing no street with an overpass on the river over there. Now if this were planned ahead enough so that there could be just on the outer edge of the boundary, that would facilitate all East-West traffic. North-South traffic is already taken by 218."

97. "Yah, well, lookit, the campus is, uh, uh, there's some like Dubuque Street, and there's some like Clinton Street, and over there, you couldn't do anything about that because that's right down town. Like Phillips Hall is right across from, you know, the down town area." (Referring to the feasibility of re-routing traffic around the campus)

98. "The students would go through anyway." (Responding to a question about what would happen if a boundary were placed around the campus and only students were not permitted to drive inside)

99. "Only in University housing?" (Responding to another question concerning whether or not the group wants to limit the possession of cars to students living in University housing)

100. "Would you could you see then maybe allowing a parking lot to be built out there on the South side of town, outside, well, not outside the city limits, but outside where most of the buildings are? Just a big lot out there that these people who just wanta drive home could park there."

Consensus Group on Grading

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy on grading?"

1. "Well, I guess there'd be a test, and you'd either pass or fail it according to a percentage they'd probably set right before the test because it couldn't go on a curve?" (Referring to a method of determining who passes in a Pass-Fail course)

2. "But that'd be kinda hard in figuring out how efficient one student is to another student if he just passed him. There'd have to be something like a high pass or a low pass, or a low fail or a high fail."

3. "Yah, it'd just be the same thing." (Referring to such classifications as "High-Pass" and "Low-Pass")

4. "There's also a lot of kids who can't make grades like other kids. I mean, they just aren't good students. They can't, they just can't make the grade."

5. "You wouldn't be taking astronomy in the first place." (Responding to a comment concerning a music major taking astronomy under a Pass-Fail system)

6. "Well, do you think that the Pass-Fail system should be included in the major field?"

7. "Just like we don't know our Intelligent Quotient, and we get along without it. Why should we understand how how we actually rate with others? Because it might just make us feel inferior or superior, and one extreme or the other, you just don't wanta have that kind of feeling."

8. "I don't see why not. I think it'd be a pretty good idea, personally." (Referring to broadening the present policy to include Sophomores and expanding the number of Pass-Fail courses from 16 to 22 semester hours)

9. "Yah, well, I don't think it works so well for undergraduate students because." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to a Pass-Fail system)

10. "If they wanted it that way." (Responding to a question concerning a policy allowing students to take all courses on a Pass-Fail basis)

11. "But I think it should include Freshmen because I don't think Freshmen know that much about what they want or what they're doing." (It refers to one of the alternative policies which the group is discussing)

12. "I think we should have Pass-Fail in the Core courses."

13. "Be able to find out what you want, in other words?" (Responding to a comment that not all courses should be Pass-Fail)

14. "You wouldn't know how to gage yourself. You wouldn't know how you are doing. You see you're passing, well, you might barely be passing. You wouldn't have any idea. You." (Referring to Freshmen taking all Pass-Fail courses)

15. "Of course, our first two years, we're mostly taking Core courses, and we couldn't take it under the Pass-Fail system, these courses. Of course, it might be nice, you know, that you could take, uh, Pass-Fail if you wanted, maybe, Sophomore year. You wanted to branch out in something and just try to see if you like it."

16. "Yah. I think Freshman year you should probably have grades cause know where you stand. I mean, like Gary says, you could be passing, but passing with pretty low grades."

17. "I think there's too much of an emphasis put on grades."

18. "I wonder if the grade of D would be passing." (Referring to the definition of passing in a Pass-Fail system)

19. "I don't know if I like it cause of that, cause D's used to pass, but with a D you can fail every instructor." (It refers to a Pass-Fail system)

20. "Bet they'd figure your grade point in that one particular course, and below 1.5, 1.6 they'd consider it failure. Anything above would be passing just like it is for Freshmen all the time."

21. "Well, in this Pass-Fail system would they, don't they, do they grade it and then say pass or fail? Are you really on a grading system?"

22. "Of course, if they're interested in that, they'll find out." (Referring to students in Pass-Fail courses who want some more precise indication of their achievement)

23. "Well, if the teacher's got some kind of record, why couldn't you go up and ask?" (Referring to teachers who keep traditional letter grades even though the students receive only P or F)

24. "Well, it's sort of a modified grading system though, really, They're both." (Interrupted at this point. It refers to a Pass-Fail system)

25. "I think it might relieve some tension." (It refers to a Pass-Fail system)

26. "Like you guys said before, but I don't think I would work as hard if I had the Pass-Fail system because you wouldn't know whether you were just ready to flunk or if you would pass it with flying colors.

You would know if you passed or failed, and you could say, "Well, I passed the course,' but, well, you may have got an A, but you're only just working on getting a D."

27. "What about when you average it out with your with the other grading system? It's going to average in there some way or other." (Referring to a grade of P or F)

28. "One thing it would do is separate the students from the flubbers." (Referring to the traditional grading system)

29. "That's kind of a good idea." (Responding to a comment that one of the advantages of the Pass-Fail system is that it enables students who may be competent in their major fields, but not in other areas to take courses without hurting their grade point averages)

30. "I mean, it's just broadening your education, that's all. That's the idea." (Referring to students' taking courses on a Pass-Fail basis that they otherwise would not take)

31. "I guess, does anybody have any idea what change that they'd like in these four different policies? Is any, is anyone partial to either one? Personally, I think number one would be about the best policy on there. I'd like to see it extended down to Freshmen."

32. "And you don't want the Core courses though?" (Directed to a discussant who stated that Freshmen should be allowed to take at least one course on a Pass-Fail basis)

33. "I have two courses right now that I would love just scored Pass-Fail."

34. "But add on to include Freshmen in one course." (Agreeing to accept one of the alternative policies with a qualification)

35. "That way you can see how you. Everybody has to take the Core courses." (Responding to a comment that Core course should not be on a Pass-Fail basis)

36. "Well, is P.E. a Core course?"

37. "I don't, I think it should be on a Pass-Fail system. I don't think we should be." (Interrupted at this point. It refers to P.E.)

38. "So the, we're pretty well all agreed on number one, broadening the present policy to include Sophomores and expanding the total amount of credit possible from Pass-Fail courses to 22 semester hours and including Freshmen, 4 hours on the Pass-Fail system. Any advantages? What would be a very good, what would be an excellent advantage?"

39. "They might be just kinda looking around. Maybe somebody might be interested in something sort of strange and just try it." (Responding

to a call for suggested advantages of the policy which the group is presently considering)

40. "The way they are now is everything's our grade, and we have to be careful of what we take, and we aren't really getting a full education cause we're just taking stuff we know we might do well in, and we're always under pressure."

41. "But it's going to affect my whole grade point." (Referring to the grade which the discussant anticipates he will receive in math)

42. "I'd put any Core course on the Pass-Fail system. I'm for grades, but." (Interrupted at this point)

43. "All through college life you've gotta be able to write a good paper in all of your courses. Somebody's gotta grade you rough cause if you didn't, then you wouldn't." (Interrupted at this point)

44. "See everybody has a different opinion on Core courses. One is, uh, you're lousy in mathematics, and so and I. He's having trouble with rhetoric; so am I, and, I mean, everybody's having a low spot and a high spot. I think phys, I think the conclusion here that I can draw is that physical education would be really the only thing that you can go on a Pass-Fail system."

45. "Okay, then we decided that Core courses in the Freshmen year under the Pass-Fail system should be, uh." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to keeping Core course under the traditional grading system)

46. "Well, if you're not, then you're gonna be in a different class. They'll put you in a special class, won't they?" (Responding to a comment concerning the inability of some students to compete with others in P.E. classes)

47. "Do you see any disadvantage in this poli this number one, plus our little addition?"

48. "It seems like quite a lot." (Referring to 22 semester hours of Pass-Fail courses)

49. "Maybe we should limit that then, uh, cut that down." (Referring to 22 semester hours of Pass-Fair courses)

50. "It's really kinda hard to tell what we want, being Freshmen, cause we really don't know how a Junior or a Sophomore or a Senior feels because we don't know what they're going through, so I don't know how we, we really can't understand this 22 semester hours that they have and they would have under this policy."

51. "Couldn't it, couldn't there be, I mean, just so long as you pass the course, you get credit for it? (Referring to Pass-Fail courses)

52. "That'd be just like grades again though." (Referring to the use of such classifications as "High Pass" and "Low Pass" in Pass-Fail courses)

53. "Well, are we trying to compete with other students, or are we trying to learn as much for ourselves as we can?"

54. "Yah, but what the present system is, it isn't in any courses that are include the major, so, like if, uh you're gonna major in music or something and you took astronomy under a Pass-Fail system, well, even if choose yourself and just barely passed it, what difference would it make if everything wasn't stars and you're gonna be a music major?"

55. "Just for an elective. Just for some more hours." (Responding to a comment that a music major wouldn't take a course in astronomy)

56. "No. Very definitely cause if they had it in the major field, and you have a hundred majors in, oh, physics or something like this, and they all passed, how's the employer gonna tell which one is better than the other? They're all equal as far as they know, but if they have grades, they can say, 'Now this guy, he's got all A's; he's tops; we want him for our company.' It'd be a lot easier. It'd be better."

57. "And then again sometimes the straight A student is the lousiest student."

58. "I mean, I'd kinda like to try a course like that." (Referring to a Pass-Fail course)

59. "I think we're just limiting ourselves here to, uh, Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors, and I suppose." (Interrupted at this point)

60. "Yah, if they wanted it that way." (Responding to a question concerning a policy allowing students to take all courses on a Pass-Fail basis)

61. "I think it'd really help a Freshman a lot better if he had Pass-Fail."

62. "Well, maybe not in the Core, but again, it's just what you want." (Referring to the kinds of courses which should be included under a Pass-Fail system)

63. "It would be hard for the Freshman to tell where he is." (Referring to a system in which all courses are Pass-Fail)

64. "As for disadvantages of the present policy, it seems that it just includes, uh, Juniors and Seniors. Maybe this is the trouble with the whole Pass-Fail system. Maybe it should be broadened down to Sophomores and maybe Freshmen so they could try it out and see what they like. Because this Juniors and Seniors, I mean, it's so far away, and you'd really like to see what this Pass-Fail system is like, and

you don't get a chance to try it until you are up there."

65. "In your Sophomore year?" (Referring to the year when a student should first be able to take Pass-Fail courses)

66. "Yah, then maybe it would be a pretty good idea to broaden the system to include Sophomores, and then instead of just, uh, what is it, 16 semester hours, it'd be nice to broaden it down to 22 semester hours to give Sophomores a pretty good chance."

67. "There is. Everytning's grades." (Referring to overemphasis on grades)

68. "I don't know. In this Pass-Fail system, they'd probably have to the D into an F or into a Fail."

69. "That's a pretty good disadvantage of the Pass-Fail system." (Referring to the use of the traditional D as a basis for failure)

70. "How would they figure out your grade point average then if if, for instance, you went through your?" (Interrupted at this point)

71. "I think you really are, but they're not giving you grades. They keep track of, they set scales and things, and you they really gave grades for you, but you don't know what they are."

72. "Could you find out, do you think?" (Referring to more information about achievement than is provided by a grade of P or F)

73. "I don't know if this Pass-Fail system is really that great cause you're still gonna kinda wanta know where you stand. You're gonna ask the teacher how you're doing."

74. "But you'll all agree that it's it helps. I mean, it's different a little bit, and it's okay if it's used on a small on a small scale compared to the other kind?" (Referring to Pass-Fail courses)

75. "Do you?" (Responding to a comment by another discussant who thinks that the Pass-Fail system could relieve tension)

76. "Yah, but let's assume that under the Pass-Fail system the teacher does keep grades, but you don't know that he is keeping grades. Won't you strive to get good grades in his eyes so that he'll record good grades?"

77. "They don't include it." (Referring to Pass-Fail grades in relation to the student's grade point average)

78. "Of course, if you are on this Pass-Fail system, you're usually taking a course that isn't wouldn't be in your major field, and cause they aren't graded, it might give you a tendency to wanta, oh, uh, explore into some material more and not really worry about the textbooks

so much, maybe, or, you know, kinda branch out and get different ideas on. You don't have to work so much for grades then."

79. "Yah, why should you be penalized for taking a course that you wanta take, and it doesn't have anything to do with your major field? I mean, I think, why should they even fail you? While you're getting the credit, they have to make some distinction, but can count quite a few benefits now under the Pass-Fail system, and, of course, that has nothing to do with your major."

80. "I really can't see it though cause you have to go into." (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that under a Pass-Fail system, students would take courses primarily for learning)

81. "In one course, you mean?" (Responding to a comment that the present policy should be broadened to include Freshmen)

82. "No, might as well leave the Core courses out." (Referring to which courses should be offered on a Pass-Fail basis)

83. "Are we all pretty well kinda agreed on number one as the proposed change?"

84. "Oh, including Freshmen in one course? In other words, allow four hours?" (Referring to Pass-Fail courses)

85. "I think the Administration needs it also to kinda base as a basis to see whether you're you're, uh, able enough to stay in college after your first year." (Referring to maintaining Core courses under the traditional grading system)

86. "No, it's just a required course." (Answering a question concerning whether or not P.E. is a Core course)

87. "That'd be, uh, that'd be probably the only Core course that could go on a Pass-Fail." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to P.E.)

88. "It's there. Anybody can take it." (Referring to courses under a Pass-Fail system)

89. "If they don't like it, they don't have to worry too much about it." (Referring to Pass-Fail courses)

90. "I don't know, I think another one of the required courses which is a semester of math." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to which courses should be on a Pass-Fail basis)

91. "Right. I'm lousy in mathematics too. It can affect my grade point."

92. "I would too." (Responding to a comment by another discussant that he would be willing to put all courses on a Pass-Fail basis)

93. "No, I I know it's good for us really to grade you rough."

94. "Yah, that would be." (Responding to a comment that P.E. is the only Core course which could be under a Pass-Fail system)

95. "What, uh, cause that's not one of the Core courses. That's required." (Referring to P.E.)

96. "Well, I don't know, but then in your in that class you're also competing against kids who are gonna major in Phys. Ed., and, I mean, naturally, they're gonna be a lot better than you, and you are graded according to your ability compared to them, and so if you can't do 20 pushups, you're gonna flunk."

97. "Would it include 22 semester hours? That's a that's a lot." (Referring to Pass-Fail courses under the policy which the group is considering)

98. "Cause like that's one course per semester and six extra hours." (Referring to the number of Pass-Fail courses to be included under the policy which the group is considering)

99. "Cause a lot of the courses that you'd take on the Pass-Fail are needed fours hours. Cause the Core courses are four hours. The languages are four hours."

100. "But I wonder why they'd want it so many semester hours. I think you could get along without that many hours." (Referring to the number of hours of Pass-Fail courses to be included under the policy which the group is considering)

Non-consensus Group on Grading

The following 100 statements have been selected from a discussion on the question: "What should be the University's policy on grading?"

1. "All right, say, to start off with, one of the major disadvantages would be the, uh, pressure on the grade point average. I think probably too much emphasis is placed on this." (Referring to the present policy)

2. "Well, I think I think it's a fine thing, but students, a number of students are coming down to the University, and they study a course for the grade and not for what's in the course. They, uh, they're there for grades, and that's it."

3. "I think the I think the competitive situation does does have some value in that most students study a lot harder if they're getting a grade for something than if they aren't. They, consequently, usually learn more."

4. "Yes, and to get a good job afterwards." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant came to college to learn)

5. "Well, that that's one method of studying. A better method is to study everything, which is more profitable. Outguessing your professor usually results in low scores."

6. "I think you should have to keep a certain grade point to stay in school or or to graduate, but then as long as you meet the minimum grade point, anything over that won't make any difference."

7. "What do you mean? You mean the, uh, Fail level would be lai raised?" (Responding to another discussant's description of a Pass-Fail system)

8. "You wanta do away with grades altogether?"

9. "You don't think it should be voluntary that a person should be able to take, uh, courses for grades?"

10. "I think that both alternatives should be offered, but I think, on second hand, that you should be able to have the prerogative of taking all of your courses on Pass-Fail."

11. "Well, they certainly should be distinguished because they work harder. They should get more recognition." (Referring to high achievers under a Pass-Fail system)

12. "That usually doesn't happen. You see, the grades the grades go to your employer and on your record." (Responding to a comment that there is no reason to give high achievers under a Pass-Fail system more recognition than others)

13. "But, uh, you've also got to take into consideration on this, uh, matter of the employer checking the grades. I don't believe they go all that closely with the college grades."

14. "Because, I mean, it it's a known fact that certain professors and instructors will grade lower than others if the student does conflict. Don't you?" (Interrupted at this point)

15. "Well, all you're saying is a modified grade system, like A, C, F instead of A, B, C, uh, D, F." (Referring to such classifications as High Pass and Low Pass under a Pass-Fail system)

16. "Well, you'd be getting rid of the grade point though. You you wouldn't have." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to a Pass-Fail system with three grade levels instead of two)

17. "Sure they would. If they got the statistics, they'll compute everything they can out of it." (Referring to maintaining grade point averages under a Pass-Fail system with three levels)

18. "How would I assume? I have the choice of taking it for grades." (Responding to a question asking the discussant how he would feel in a

situation in which he does much better work than another student, yet both receive a grade of Pass)

19. "In other words, you're saying that if I made a tremendous blunder and got into Pass-Fail when I shouldn't be, yes, then I'd be disappointed. How many students are going to make that sort of error? I assume they'd be able to drop that as well as other courses. Drop it or take it for credit, whatever."

20. "I think the major field should be a a A through F grade system."

21. "So then what you're suggesting is that they, any courses in the major field A through F, and any of the electives or your Core courses are on a Pass-Fail."

22. "That's just what you said." (Responding to a question concerning why the discussant feels that courses in the major field should be kept under an A to F grading system)

23. "Well, I think the teacher's certificate with the stipulation that you took all Pass-Fail courses. This isn't like a teacher's certificate where you go out, uh, and present yourself to the nearest school board, and they must hire you. You tell them you took everything Pass-Fail, and they aren't likely to. There's still there are still standards for judging you, which is the important thing."

24. "Well, that's what you're gonna be teaching. You're gonna be using that. I'm never gonna speak speak Spanish." (Referring to which courses should and should not be included in a Pass-Fail system)

25. "If you went to an employer for a job interview, and you were going to, uh, work and, say the engineering department, cause you're an engineer, okay, to further his point, is it going to be that much different to your employer what you got in, say, Religion and Human Culture?"

26. "And if you had all of your engineering grades, all those that are pertinent to his information needed as to whether, uh, it would be a feasible idea to hire you or not, and he had all these in front of him, and the rest of them you've satisfactorily completed, I don't think it'd make that much difference to him."

27. "So you're saying no Core Courses?" (Responding to a comment that students should not have to take any courses which they do not wish to take)

28. "Okay, then why don't you go to a technical school? Why do you come to a university? (Directed to a discussant who stated that students should not have to take any courses they do not wish to take)

29. "You can be out in two years, you can be out in two years in a technical school."

30. "Well, isn't the premise of a University to have their graduates come out with a well rounded education?"

31. "Do you feel that a person could have a normal life should be well versed in just one area?"

32. "Would you feel more comfortable around people if you know more than straight engineering?"

33. "Do you think you could do that for four years? Think they've got that many courses that you could just take what you want for four years?"

34. "Okay, but let me ask you another question. You were talking a while back about your employer, or possible employer, and his total view of what a person should be under his employ. Now, if he had two people, both of them with the same proficiency in engineering, all right, and one of them, all he took was engineering, and the other was had more of a background, I mean, I'm not saying he has to have." (Interrupted at this point)

35. "What the employer does is not my business either. My business is getting the sort of education I want or need or whatever criteria." (Interrupted at this point)

36. "What if you didn't care? Then what are you here for? My Gosh!" (Concerning whether or not one of the discussants cares about getting a job)

37. "But what if you were the employer? Would you would you want?" (Interrupted at this point)

38. "What if I were the United States Army? What would I expect from my college graduates?"

39. "Pardon me." (Meaning "I did not understand.")

40. "Of course not, but I have no right to tell them what to take in college." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant, if he were an employer, would want his employees to be knowledgeable in only one area)

41. "That's right, I would, but we aren't we aren't, the University's purpose is not to, uh, train people for future employment or for academic pursuits or whatever. It's the it's to train them for whatever they want, not to satisfy the employers of America or the police or the Army or anybody else or the Government's idea of what a good citizen should be. A citizen has rights, and those should be uppermost in a public university. They're trying to decide what the students' self-interests should be, and that's a decision which has to be left to the student."

42. "Well, the question is what are they doing here?" (Responding to a comment that some Freshmen would not know how they are doing in school under a Pass-Fail system)

43. "Well, they wouldn't have to take Pass-Fail if they were worried about it." (Referring to Freshmen)

44. "I think they'd walk into the Pass-Fail cause certainly they'd think it'd be easier, and they wouldn't have anything to stand on. They'd just kinda." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to Freshmen)

45. "Are you gonna decide how they should run their lives? (Referring to Freshmen)

46. "Well, uh, take A through F first semester." (Referring to the kind of grading system that Freshmen could be under while adjusting to university life)

47. "Cause you're 18, that makes you mature?" (Responding to a discussant who said he was 18)

48. "Cause you're 18, you can go out and do anything cause you're 18?"

49. "I have the same intelligence I'll have ten years from now."

50. "Well, who's gonna decide who's mature?"

51. "What's wrong with the grade point average?"

52. "You think that harms the learning process then?" (Referring to students who study only for the purpose of getting good grades)

53. "Well, that may be true, but what did you come to college for? To learn a great deal of things." (Responding to a comment concerning the value of a competitive grading system)

54. "Right, okay, but now but the problem presented with this is the, uh, method of study is turning into more of a game, uh, whether you can outguess the professor or instructor, or whatever the case may be, as to what he's gonna have on his test. I mean, let's face it. I think the majority." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to a competitive grading system)

55. "But you've got to admit that after a certain number of, uh, exams have been given, there's certain patterns set up and you expect a test to be that way." (Referring to students who attempt to outguess their instructors rather than study for tests)

56. "I think if they were to change over to the Pass-Fail system as such that their academic level for Pass should be higher than the present D. Maybe between a high D and a low C. And then there should be distinctions because for those that, uh, get quite a bit above average."

57. "The fail level would be raised, right? And those that get extremely accomplished in the course, uh, you know, comparable to maybe and A, that's it, should get special recognition." (Referring to the administration of a Pass-Fail system)

58. "For the most part, yes." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant feels that grades should be abolished)

59. "I suppose that would be a a good system for those that feel they could do okay on an A to F system, but I would imagine that most people that would be taking it, uh, would be those students that feel they could get higher grades because I don't think that." (Interrupted at this point. Referring to a voluntary Pass-Fail system)

60. "I agree." (Referring to allowing students to take courses on either a Pass-Fail or A to F basis)

61. "Why? Have it posted on the board? Is that all he wants? To get a?" (Interrupted at this point. Responding to a comment that under a Pass-Fail system top students should be given special recognition)

62. "All right, if you're worried about the grades for your employer, then you take, uh, courses for credit. If not, you take Pass-Fail. You won't get a very good job afterwards, of course, but that's the business of the individual student."

63. "That's the most important factor to most of them" (Referring to the importance of grades to employers)

64. "Sometimes, yah. Some of them will do it." (Referring to instructors who lower grades if students conflict with them)

65. "Well, that's what this would turn out to be. I mean, it wouldn't be just straight Pass-Fail. It'd probably be A, C, and Fail."

66. "Not really, because you could have a grade point with that too." (Referring to a Pass-Fail system with three grade levels)

67. "No, it's just like putting people that did well, like he says, they'll give them an A, and so the kids that, you know, would normally get a B or a D would give them a C. Just Pass or Fail." (Referring to a Pass-Fail system with three grade levels, A, C, and F)

68. "No, I'm talking if you were just in, now this is no other alternative, just Pass-Fail Pass-Fail. Don't you don't you believe?" (Interrupted at this point)

69. "But what I'm trying to say is if they do have a Pass-Fail system, no other alternatives, this is just a hypothetical case, all they have at this particular college is just a Pass-Fail system, don't you believe that the upper, like 5 percent, this is just a, like upper 5 percent should get some special recognition for doing exceedingly good work?"

70. "Your major would be A through F." (Referring to which course should be kept in the traditional grading system)

71. "Well, any of the courses you that are required for your major." (Referring to which courses should be kept in the traditional grading system)

72. "No, it isn't." (Responding to a comment by another discussant that the present discussant had said earlier that courses in the major field should be kept under the traditional grading system)

73. "Your major should be on the A to F system, but what, like I say, what's the difference if the rest of them aren't?"

74. "All right, all right. If you're worried about that, then take A through F on that. If not, then don't sweat it. If you don't care about showing your superiority, then, uh, there's no reason you should take A through F on anything." (That refers to major field courses)

75. "It'd be of some consequence to him, yes. He'll look at the total grade point as well." (Referring to an employer considering a prospective employee)

76. "All right, you're saying, uh, you're asking what should the student take to, uh, get maximum consideration. I'm saying let the student take what he wants to. Let him worry about what he should take. Set up the system so he can take whatever he wants to under a." (Interrupted at this point)

77. "That's right." (Responding to a question asking if it is the discussant's position that students should not have to take Core courses unless they want to)

78. "It's cheaper here. I'm not satisfied with the system. That's not why I'm here." (Responding to a question about why the discussant had not gone to a technical school instead of the University)

79. "Not with a B.S. degree. There isn't a chance of it. I'm satisfied with the system. I'm satisfied enough to compromise, but that doesn't mean I wanta change or not change it." (Responding to a comment that one can get out of a technical school in two years)

80. "This is a public university. The only function of the University here should be to, uh, serve the students in whatever they want desire it to serve them. They have a right to that."

81. "I think that's up to the individual. It's no one else's business. If I wanta be ignorant in religion, that's my business, no one else's. No one should be allowed to tell me what I must know and what I must not."

82. "What do you mean, 'if'? Does that matter? How I select my friends isn't the business of the University either, or how my friends

select me. I don't think the purpose of the University should be to produce a well-rounded individual. That's not what the student wants. It's the student's decision, not the University's. They have no right to make his decisions. It's none of their business."

83. "You bet I could. They've got the whole engineering curriculum outlined. I'd take that and like 10 hours of electives." (Responding to a question about whether or not the discussant feels that the University has enough courses so that he could take only courses that he likes for four years)

84. "You're asking which one would be hired." (Responding to a comment comparing two prospective employees, equally proficient in engineering, but one of whom has a broader educational background than the other)

85. "You don't want a job? You don't care if you get a job when you get out of college?"

86. "I wanted an education, my kind of education. If I'm not worried about a job, if my father makes $100,000 a year and can give me a job in his corporation, then, uh, why should I worry about satisfying these, uh, absurd requirements?"

87. "Am I supposed to serve my employer? Am I supposed to serve America at large?"

88. "No, but say you start with a corporation and you were the employer. Would you like your employees to be up on just one subject and be ignorant in the rest?"

89. "Would you want your employees to be expert in that one area and ignorant in the rest?"

90. "Okay, but what are you gonna do? You're gonna hire somebody else." (Referring to an employer considering a prospective employee who is knowledgeable in only one area)

91. "Do you think that something like on an all Pass-Fail system should be left to all students?"

92. "I think about every Freshman would fail." (Referring to Freshmen under a Pass-Fail system)

93. "You mean have it so that A to F they could take that or?" (Interrupted at this point. Referring to Freshmen)

94. "That's their business." (Responding to a comment that Freshmen would be likely to take all Pass-Fail courses if they could because they would think that such courses are easier)

95. "No, I'm not going to. I mean, cause they're new, they don't know anything about it. They have to." (Interrupted at this point.

Responding to a comment concerning whether or not the discussant is attempting to say how Freshmen should lead their lives)

96. "That'd probably be better." (Referring to keeping Freshmen under the traditional grading system during their first semester)

97. "Yah." (Responding to a question concerning whether or not the discussant feels that because he is 18, he is therefore mature)

98. "Why not? Why not?" (Responding to a question asking if 18 year olds should be allowed to do anything they wish)

99. "But just because you're a certain age doesn't mean that you're mature enough to handle it, does it?" (Referring to allowing 18 year olds to do anything they wish)

100. "Well, why do you think that just because you're 18, you you're free to make all of your own decisions and?" (Interrupted at this point)

APPENDIX I

ANALYSES OF SEX DIFFERENCES

Because of my inability to maintain a uniform sex distribution in all of the groups which I studied, I decided to determine if the statements of males were different from those of females on any of the variables. By listening to the original recording of each discussion, I was able to classify the 300 statements used in the analyses of variance by sex. Males made 212 of the statements, and females made 88. I then ran a separate _t_-test of the mean difference between the statements of males and females on each variable. The results are presented in Table I-1.

TABLE I-1

_t_-TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STATEMENTS OF MALES AND FEMALES ON EIGHT DISCUSSION VARIABLES

Variable	$\bar{X}$ for Males	$\bar{X}$ for Females	t
Clarity	23.542	23.000	.879
Opinionatedness	24.142	23.409	2.402*
Interest	25.689	24.932	1.727
Information	10.108	8.045	5.175*
Provocativeness	19.712	18.182	1.569
Orientation	18.925	17.091	4.267*
Objectivity	16.731	14.795	2.883*
Length	27.585	22.670	1.914

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table I-1 shows that the statements of males were significantly different from those of females on four of the eight variables. The statements of the males were less opinionated, more informative, higher in orientation, and more objective than those of the females.

Because of the variation in the number of contributions which females made from group to group, it was not possible to make any finer comparisons on such bases as topic and type of group. The results suggest, however, that sex differences are pronounced enough to warrant greater control of the variable in future research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Baird, A. Craig. Public Discussion and Debate. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1937.

Bales, R. F. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1950.

Barnlund, Dean C., and Franklyn S. Haiman. The Dynamics of Discussion. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1960.

Blommers, Paul, and E. F. Lindquist. Elementary Statistical Methods in Psychology and Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1960.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Alvin Zander. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960.

Cortright, Rupert L., and George L. Hinds. Creative Discussion. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Dewey, John. How We Think. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1910.

Ewbank, Henry L., and J. Jeffery Auer. Discussion and Debate. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.

Gulley, Halbert E. Discussion, Conference, and Group Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Harman, Harry. Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Harnack, R. Victor, and Thorrel B. Fest. Group Discussion: Theory and Technique. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964.

Keltner, John W. Group Discussion Processes. New York: Longmans, Green, 1957.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1953.

McBurney, James H., and Kenneth G. Hance. Discussion in Human Affairs. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Phillips, Gerald M. Communication and the Small Group. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Sherif, Carolyn W., and Muzafer Sherif. *Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

Anderson, Lynn R., and William J. McGuire. "Prior Reassurance of Group Consensus as a Factor in Producing Resistance to Persuasion," *Sociometry*, XXVIII (1965), 46-56.

Backman, C. W., P. F. Secord, and J. R. Pierce. "Resistance to Change in the Self-Concept as a Function of Consensus Among Significant Others," *Sociometry*, XXVI (1963), 102-111.

Bennett, Edith. "Discussion, Decision Commitment, and Consensus in 'Group Decision,'" *Human Relations*, VIII (1955), 251-273.

Bowers, John W. "Language Intensity, Social Introversion, and Attitude Change," *Speech Monographs*, XXX (1963), 346-352.

Deutsch, Morton. "A Theory of Cooperation and Competition," *Human Relations*, II (1949), 129-152.

________, and Harold B. Gerard. "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences upon Individual Judgment," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LI (1955), 629-636.

Ebel, Robert L. "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," *Psychometrika*, XVI (1951), 407-424.

Guetzkow, Harold, and John Gyr. "An Analysis of Conflict in Decision-Making Groups," *Human Relations*, VII (1954), 367-382.

Hare, Paul A. "A Study of Interaction and Consensus in Different Sized Groups," *American Sociological Review*, XVII (1952), 261-267.

Johnson, Alma. "An Experimental Study in the Analysis and Measurement of Reflective Thinking," *Speech Monographs*, X (1943), 83-96.

Keltner, John W. "Communication in Discussion and Group Processes: Some Research Trends of the Decade 1950-1959," *Journal of Communication*, X (1960), 195-204.

Nichols, Allan C. "Audience Ratings of the 'Naturalness' of Spoken and Written Sentences," *Speech Monographs*, XXXIII (1966), 155-159.

Riecken, Henry W. "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions to Problems," *Sociometry*, XXI (1958), 309-321.

Sharp, Harry Jr., and Joyce Milliken. "Reflective Thinking Ability and the Product of Problem-Solving Discussion," *Speech Monographs*, XXXI (1964), 124-127.

Shelley, Harry P. "Status Consensus, Leadership, and Satisfaction with the Group," Journal of Social Psychology, LI (1960), 157-164.

Unpublished Material

Bowers, John W. "Language Intensity, Social Introversion, and Attitude Change." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Department of Speech, University of Iowa, 1962.

Lott, John A. "Group Composition, Communication, and Consensus: An Investigation According to Newcomb's Theory of Communication." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, 1959.

Thompson, Wendel. "Message Intensity as a Variable in the Application of the Congruity Principle and Message Discrepancy Theory." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Department of Speech, University of Iowa, 1965.

White, Martha F. "Attitude Change as Related to Perceived Group Consensus." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, 1954.